

THE ACLS NEWSLETTER

City Library

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
A MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME V

NUMBER 2

Contents

	PAGE
For the Record	3
On the Conflict between the "Liberal Arts" and the "Schools of Education"	17
Scholars Look at Education	39
Report of the Twenty-eighth Session of the Union Académique Internationale	47
The United States Book Exchange	48
The Renaissance Society of America	49
Notes	52
International Notes	57

ADMINISTRATION

OFFICERS

Chairman

C. W. de Kiewiet, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Vice-Chairman

Theodore C. Blegen, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Secretary

William R. Parker, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Treasurer

Sidney Painter, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Walter R. Agard
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Curt F. Buhler
PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY

Irwin Edman
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Rensselaer Lee
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Roger P. McCutcheon
TULANE UNIVERSITY

Henri Peyre
YALE UNIVERSITY

Robert Redfield
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

B. J. Whiting
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

EXECUTIVE STAFF

Mortimer Graves, *Executive Director*

D. H. Daugherty, *Assistant to the Director*

J. F. Wellemeyer, *Staff Adviser on Personnel Studies*

William A. Parker, *Secretary for Fellowships*

Shirley Duncan Hudson, *Public Affairs Officer*

Alice M. Harger, *Bursar*

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office at Richmond, Virginia. Published quarterly by The American Council of Learned Societies. Address all communications regarding the ACLS Newsletter to (Mrs.) Shirley Duncan Hudson, at the Office of Publication, Box 2-W, Richmond 5, Virginia, or at the business office at 1219 16th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

For the Record

THE Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations began its hearings in May. As one of the recipients of foundation support, the ACLS figures both in the background papers prepared by the Committee staff and in some of the testimony before it. Early in July the Committee announced the cessation of public hearings but notified the foundations and national councils of its willingness to accept written statements within a certain time limit. The following letter of transmittal from the Chairman of the Board of Directors and statement, prepared by the Executive Staff of the ACLS and signed and verified by Mortimer Graves, the Executive Director, were submitted to the Committee on July 21, 1954.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

1219 Sixteenth Street, N. W.

Washington 6, D. C.

July 21, 1954

The Honorable Carroll Reece

Chairman, Special Committee of the House of Representatives

to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations

131 Indiana Avenue, N. W.

Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Sir:

I am enclosing a statement from the American Council of Learned Societies to be submitted to the Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations. This statement has been verified by Mortimer Graves, who is the Executive Director of the Council.

In submitting this statement the American Council of Learned Societies reserves the right to file further statements in the event that further allegations are made against it.

I cannot forego the opportunity of commenting upon the unwisdom of the aspersions that have been cast upon the scholars and teachers for whom the American Council of Learned Societies is proud to speak. Education is a principal architect of American greatness in all fields, political as well as scientific, cultural as well as technological. We owe our solidarity in an age of crisis to the manner in which we have taught the history and politics of the nation. An attack upon education becomes in part an attack upon American history, an attack, indeed, upon the defensive system of this country. Faith is lessened, courage is diminished, and essential bonds are broken. To lay broad and loose charges against education

can itself become a form of subversion against which it is the duty of intellectual leaders to speak forcibly and emphatically.

I feel grateful to the Reece Committee for at least recognizing that humane studies are powerful forces in any society. Statements apparently made by staff members of the Committee misconstrue the nature of that power and assign to it a baneful influence. The American Council of Learned Societies welcomes the opportunity to reassert its faith in the beneficial power exercised by the thought and studies of the responsible men who make the study of man their lifework. It is an influence that cannot be suppressed. Only those societies try to do so that are fearful of freedom. What we know to be great in our society, our political thought, our humane laws, our sense of human dignity, our powers of self-discovery and self-realization, are all born of the humanist mind. To preserve and extend these is the real function of all those for whom the American Council of Learned Societies elects to speak. Wisdom cannot be bought, and accepts no dictation. Scholarship and learning are the foundation of the nation's wisdom and skill. A society in which scholars and teachers are held in honor is far more likely to produce the wisdom and skill without which it cannot survive in the modern world.

As an individual I honor the solicitude of Congress and its agents for the national welfare. As Chairman of its Board of Directors I offer the full cooperation of the American Council of Learned Societies in creating a wise understanding of the achievements of American scholarship in the service of America.

Very sincerely yours,

C. W. de Kiewiet

Chairman, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
(*President, University of Rochester*)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
TO THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

This statement is submitted by the American Council of Learned Societies in accordance with the procedure established by the Committee and communicated to the Council by telephone to its counsel on July 8, 1954.

In the preliminary reports prepared by the staff of the Committee and in the testimony taken in open hearing by the Committee, interest and concern were expressed in the activities of the Council. Without directly and specifically charging any improper activity, the reports and testimony strongly implied that this organization, together with others, has engaged in some

kind of conspiracy with the foundations, and that it has acted as a "clearing house" for the development and propagation of ideas that are in some indefinite way not consistent with our form of government.

The fantasy of these suggestions has been fully demonstrated in the testimony given on behalf of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council on Education. Presumably, the decision to dispense with further open hearings records the Committee's judgment that the charges and innuendoes contained in the staff reports and in the early testimony were so completely without foundation as not to warrant serious consideration. The American Council of Learned Societies agrees with this conclusion. Nevertheless, serious charges have been made and publicized. In order to keep the record straight, the Council believes it desirable to avail itself of the Committee's offer to present a factual picture of the Council's organization and activities.

At the very outset it should be stated that to the knowledge of the Council no individual member of the Council, its board of directors or staff is now or ever has been a Communist. No society constituent of the Council is or has been listed by the Attorney General or in any other way designated as a subversive organization.

On the contrary, it is our belief that one of the most effective ways to combat subversive ideas and activities is by the spread and promotion of the humanistic studies with which the Council is concerned.

*Origin and Organization
of the American Council
of Learned Societies*

The American Council of Learned Societies was founded shortly after World War I to represent academic societies concerned in the fields of humanities in joint dealings with comparable groups in other countries. The Council remains today a federative body of humanistic learned societies, for the purpose of dealing with the interests of those organizations which extend beyond the scope of any of the particular constituent societies.

To explain more precisely the Council's area of concern, it is desirable to attempt a definition of "the humanities" as a field of study. Many such efforts have been made, without any wholly satisfactory result. It is possible to get some view of what is meant by listing the constituent societies of the Council:

American Philosophical Society
American Academy of Arts and Sciences
American Antiquarian Society
American Oriental Society
American Numismatic Society

American Philological Association
Archaeological Institute of America
Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis
Modern Language Association of America
American Historical Association
American Economic Association
American Folklore Society
American Philosophical Association
American Anthropological Association
American Political Science Association
Bibliographical Society of America
Association of American Geographers
American Sociological Society
College Art Association of America
History of Science Society
Linguistic Society of America
Mediaeval Academy of America
Far Eastern Association
American Society for Aesthetics
American Musicological Society

The humanities are concerned, then, with the things that are specifically human about man—his language, his history, his attempts to reach beyond knowledge of his tangible world through philosophy and religion, and his realization of beauty through literature, music, and the arts.

The Council maintains an office at 1219 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., with a full time staff of about a dozen people. . . . In the past, administrative expenses, including office rent and staff salaries, have run to about \$100,000 annually.

Activities of the Council

Within the humanistic field, the Council's activities are directed broadly at the training and development of American scholars, the provision of new implements of study and research in these disciplines, and the addition to our humanistic knowledge. Any selection of the activities of the Council for description here can only be illustrative of the range of its concern.

One further introductory remark is appropriate. In general, the Council's activities touch directly only a relatively small group of scholars in institutions of higher learning, libraries, museums, and the like throughout the country. But, although these programs do not achieve great public notice, the Council has always worked completely in the open, and has been subject to the fullest scrutiny by anyone interested. Its activities are reported in *Bulletins* recording its annual meetings and the work of the year there discussed. In

recent years it has published a quarterly *Newsletter*, and of course, much of the research which the Council fosters eventually finds its way into print.

So far as known to the Council, none of these activities—all of them widely publicized—has ever called forth any question or complaint as to the propriety or integrity of the Council's operations.

Wartime language program—Before turning to the Council's present-day activities, it may be instructive to review the one program in its history which had a direct impact on large numbers of American men and women. That was the Council's work in the development of language training during World War II. It is very proud of its achievement in preparing the common defense, and this effort also illustrates the unexpected values which are sometimes derived from careful research in remote and what some may consider "impractical" fields of study.

Languages and linguistics, of course, are the basis of all the work in the humanistic disciplines. They have been of concern to the Council from its beginning. In 1927, accordingly, the Council began the collection and study of the American Indian languages, then rapidly disappearing, as an undertaking in the interest of pure linguistic science. The funds were supplied by the Carnegie Corporation.

It soon turned out that these languages could not be fitted satisfactorily into the descriptive patterns derived from Greek and Latin which had been worked out for the study of European languages. The small group of American linguists engaged in this study began to develop a completely new and American approach to the study and description of linguistic phenomena, which, a decade later, became the new science of American descriptive and structural linguistics. So rapid were the strides in this field, and so fruitful the development, that it can only be compared to the process that took place in the same period in the much more publicized field of nuclear physics.

A year or more before the American entry into World War II, members of the Council and its staff began to realize that, in the event of war, there would be an urgent national need for training in Asiatic languages. Yet teachers, textbooks, dictionaries, teaching materials to fill that need were not available. The Council began to examine the possibility of applying the new techniques developed in the study of American Indian languages to the study and teaching of other languages not in the European tradition, and specifically the languages of Asia which were destined to become crucially important.

With funds from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Council started its Intensive Language Program. Before Pearl Harbor, this program had developed a general approach to the problem of teaching Americans to speak these exotic languages, and had made substantial progress in the preparation of teaching aids and tools in specific languages such as Chinese, Japanese,

Persian, Siamese, Malay, and Turkish. The work had progressed to the point that, at the outbreak of the war, the Council was prepared to move into a full-scale teaching operation. This was done rapidly, beginning with Siamese at the University of Michigan, and by the summer of 1942, 56 courses were being taught in 26 institutions, in 22 languages, most of which had never before been formally taught in the United States.

When, early in 1942, the armed forces turned their attention to the language training problem, the pioneering developmental work done under the auspices of the Council was ready to hand. A fruitful collaboration was established, with Council staff members advising and consulting with the various branches of the armed forces which needed people with special language proficiencies. The Council staff was expanded; in the work of preparing dictionaries, texts, and teaching manuals in a multitude of languages there were at times as many as 100 people on its payroll. The money was supplied by the Armed Forces.

The Council participated with the Army in the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) language and area courses; with the Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) of the Adjutant General's Office; and with the Language Branch of G-2 in organizing the operation of classroom instruction and the production of teaching tools.

At the end of the war, the whole enterprise was dropped by the Army as a part of our sudden demobilization. The Council continued to publish textbooks and dictionaries through Henry Holt and Company, and to produce new ones slowly as the funds could be found. Among the casualties of this sudden termination was an almost completed Korean-English dictionary, which would have been immensely useful a few years later, but which, at the time, was still reposing on file cards, unpublished.

American studies—Most of the Council's current activities are not so spectacular as the wartime language program just discussed. But this does not measure their usefulness.

The improvement of college and university study of the American tradition and experience has always bulked large in Council concerns. A fair share of our effort and of the funds which we have had available to aid research and publication have been directed in this field.

Perhaps the largest undertaking in this area is the *Dictionary of American Biography*, of which the first twenty volumes appeared from 1928 to 1936 and the first supplementary volume in 1944. Funds for this enterprise came from the *New York Times*, assisted by the large foundations.

The project envisages a single ready reference for the facts about the lives of distinguished Americans. Unfortunately, the dislocations of the war threw the work somewhat off schedule. We have just succeeded in raising funds for the compilation of the second supplementary volume, and are now enter-

ing upon its production. We hope to have the whole operation back on schedule before long.

Of equal scientific importance, but without such wide appeal, is the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada*. Here the attempt is to analyze and record the variations and nuances in spoken English from section to section of the continent. The first six immense volumes, covering New England, appeared between 1939 and 1944. Continuation of this work proceeds very slowly as the funds for it can be secured. Unfortunately, this may be too slowly, since regional variations in American speech are beginning to become obscured or to die out.

Extending humanistic scholarship beyond the West European tradition—The modern study of humanities began with the Renaissance and its liberating rediscovery of the great civilizations of classical antiquity. It was for the study of these classical civilizations of Greece and Rome that the early humanistic tools and training were designed. The results of this orientation for the subsequent development of the West are so great as to defy description. Nevertheless it had an unfortunate effect, from the point of view of the study of humanities, in that traditionally these studies have concentrated on the classical and Mediterranean civilizations, and the West European and American traditions derivative from them, to the almost complete neglect of the rest of human experience.

Starting from a conference held on December 1, 1928, to discuss means for the development of Chinese studies in the United States, the Council has taken leadership in correcting this deficiency by creating in American universities and colleges a better basis for studying the civilizations of Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, particularly Russia. It has used every means available to it, including the provision of fellowships and study aids, to develop Americans trained in these fields, and to produce the implements—guides, translations, textbooks, bibliographies, catalogues—without which this kind of study cannot be carried on. It is not too much to say that there has been no significant improvement in the study of these areas in any American university or college, so far as the humanistic fields are concerned, in which the Council has not been in some way involved.

In this broad field of endeavor, a number of lines of activity emerge clearly. One of the most important of these is the program of translating significant works of humanistic study from their original languages into English. In the past, these translation programs have included works in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Hebrew languages.

The Council's most recent effort in this field is a Near Eastern translation program. The five modern Arabic works which have so far been published under this program include analyses of the great controversies that pervade contemporary Muslim religion. Five more volumes are just going to

press and about twenty others are in various stages of editorial progress.

Currently also it is bringing to a close a Russian translation series, which has concentrated on contemporary works. Among the 30 to 40 published volumes of this series are Vyshinsky's *Law of the Soviet State*, Berg's *Economic Geography of the USSR*, Glebov's *History of Russian Music*, and others. It has also reprinted about 30 books in the original Russian, which were otherwise unavailable in this country. Among these was the 1941 *Five Year Plan*, of which only one copy had previously existed in the United States. These works have been invaluable, not only to American scholars, but to our foreign policy officials and intelligence agencies such as the CIA, and they are, often, the only authentic source materials that are available to scholars and others interested in these fields.

Another comparable translating venture is the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*. This is a weekly publication containing sixty to seventy thousand words of translation of current Russian press and periodical literature. It was begun by the Council, and is now carried on by it jointly with the Social Science Research Council from headquarters in New York. It has been justly called the "biggest hole there is in the iron curtain."

Language and linguistics—In recent years a grant of funds from the Ford Foundation has made it possible to take up again some of the work in language teaching materials and methods which was left unfinished at the end of the war. The Council now has work going in about twenty languages, including the revived Korean-English dictionary. Its ambition is to have a good American textbook on modern linguistic principles, a satisfactory students' dictionary, some graded readings, and a set of phonograph records to be used in teaching for every significant Asian language, that is, every language spoken by more than 10 million people.

Meanwhile, the work has been expanded to include the problem in reverse: i.e., methods of teaching English to speakers of other languages. This too has required the creation of new techniques and new materials, the most important of which is a series of textbooks for teaching English to Koreans, Indonesians, Turks, Persians, Thais, Serbo-Croatians, Burmese, Viet-Namese, Greeks, Chinese, and to speakers of Spanish.

The problem of highly trained and specialized personnel—In the future, no less than in the past, the people of the United States will not be able to depend upon numbers to maintain its leadership and security. We are a small numerical minority of the world's population. Our continued progress, our security, even our survival will depend, as it has in the past, on our ability to utilize our resources of trained intelligence. An increasing recognition has been given to this problem in the laboratory and engineering sciences. But the need is no less pressing in the fields of humanistic study. The Council has directed, and intends in the future to direct its attention to this weak spot in the nation's armor.

Naturally, officers and staff members of the Council have a very wide acquaintance among scholars and teachers professionally concerned with the humanities. Concerning some of the people the Council has detailed information derived from its special activities. For instance, its work in the development of Asian and Russian studies has given it, for many years, comprehensive knowledge of the academic personnel working in those fields. And the many applications for its various fellowships, study-aids, and grants in aid of research comprise a file of the academic and professional careers of many scholars in all humanistic fields.

Up to 1949 the collection and dissemination of this information was haphazard and incidental. In that year, however, money was secured from the Rockefeller Foundation to make more formal investigations into the supply, potential, and distribution of trained personnel in the humanities. Hardly had these studies started when the Office of Naval Research and the Department of Defense became interested in the same problems, and asked the Council to make a more elaborate investigation of them. With the cooperation of as many of the constituent societies as possible, the Council gathered detailed professional information from some 27,000 scholars and students in the humanities and social sciences, probably about half of those professionally engaged in these fields. From these materials, when they had been coded and indexed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics abstracted the statistical information required by the Office of Naval Research. The Office was supplied with a microfilm of the schedules for its records, and the schedules themselves became what is now called the National Registration in the Humanities and Social Sciences, an imperfect instrument, but still the best accumulation of such personnel information available.

This kind of personnel work is done in close cooperation with the National Science Foundation, which maintains a similar register in the natural and physical sciences. In conjunction with the Foundation, the Council compiled and published a book, *Classifications for Surveys of Highly Trained Personnel*, which is now the standard guide on the subject.

It is hoped that work in this field can be improved to the point where the Registration can be a source not only of information about the professional competences of individuals, but a basis for analysis of American potential in trained specialists in the humanistic fields, so that gaps in our specialized armament can be discovered and filled and we can be prepared for any emergency which the future might bring. Anyone who participated in the frenzied search for specially trained personnel in the early days of World War II realizes the magnitude of this task. We should never have to face it like again.

The Charges Made Before the Committee

Against the background of the factual description of the Council and its

activities presented above, it is useful to examine more directly some of the charges made against the Council before this Committee, either in staff reports or in testimony. Other witnesses have sufficiently indicated the difficulty of trying to pinpoint the charges and identify them with any precision. Nevertheless, it is easy to see what the gravamen is.

It is suggested that the Council, together with other research councils, has "dominated American scholarship." It is implied that this power has been exercised to foist upon America policies and ideas alien to its heritage, and indeed subversive of its institutions. The mechanisms by which this end was achieved are said to be that the Council has acted as a "clearing house" for channeling monies from the foundations to students and causes congenial to these subversive ends, and as a recruiting agency to place similarly oriented individuals in positions of importance in government.

As for the allegation of "dominance" there must be more than a little irony in it for anyone who has visited the offices of the Council or read its financial reports and the reports of its annual proceedings. To make such a charge demonstrates an almost unbelievable ignorance of the mode of organization of American scholarship.

The American tradition, as has been pointed out in other statements to the Committee, places the responsibility for scholarship, science, and higher learning in private, not governmental, hands. The result has been a national structure for the cultivation of this field of human activity of which Americans have every right to be proud, and which attests the fundamental soundness of that tradition.

It is a truism that Americans are the world's greatest joiners. Behind this truism, however, is the fact that our fantastic genius for spontaneous self-organization is one of the elements that has made this country what it is, and in particular has preserved vast areas of activity from governmental control.

This free-enterprise, self-organizing capacity is found in American business, philanthropy, politics, and social activity. It is found also in the fields of science, scholarship, and higher learning. We have almost 2,000 separate institutions of higher learning, each going its own way, without centralized planning or control. In many countries abroad, they would be marching in step under the direction of a governmental Ministry of Education.

Much the same is true of the organization of science, scholarship, and higher learning outside the universities. Abroad this is usually taken care of by a national academy of arts and sciences, such as was founded in France by Louis XIV and in Russia by Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine. Such academies are governmentally controlled and supported. Their members are selected, of course, for scholarly and scientific eminence, but too frequently with at least one eye on their conformity with the government.

In the United States we do it differently. Our instinct for private organiza-

tion has led to the formation of private associations—professional, scientific, or learned societies—to pursue a shared interest in some scientific or scholarly activity. There are literally thousands of these societies, of all sizes, interests, and degrees of formality. Most of them have only local importance. Perhaps a couple of hundred have national membership and significance. Practically all of them are freely open to any person who shares their respective interests and is able to pay the usually modest dues.

In general, each of these private scientific or learned societies devotes itself to a specific branch of study: history, chemistry, archaeology, geology, etc. But sometimes, interests call for activity across these artificial lines which separate the branches of learning. Among the most important of these is the promotion of research and scholarship in the whole field of which the particular branch is a part. For these limited purposes, the most important of these scientific and learned societies have joined together in four national groups called councils: the National Research Council, based on constituent societies in the natural, mathematical and biological sciences; the Social Science Research Council, based on societies concerned with economics, political science, sociology and the like; the American Council on Education, based on societies as well as institutions of higher learning concerned with the techniques of college education; and the American Council of Learned Societies, based, as has been shown, on societies concerned with the humanistic studies.

These councils differ somewhat in size, structure, wealth, and methods of operation, but they are all distinctly private organizations, based on private associations and dependent upon private sources of funds for their support.

While the four councils are quite separate in every respect, they did, in 1944, create a mechanism for functioning together whenever that seems desirable. Two delegates from each of the councils meet approximately once a year in an informal group (it does not even have its own stationery, much less a staff) known as the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. This Board is quite without power and is simply a consultative body, which on rare occasions is used to carry forward enterprises in which all the councils have an interest.

For about a generation these organizations have devoted themselves to the creation of an American scholarship worthy of the richest and most powerful nation in history—and not without success. Nothing like this simple, democratic structure of scholarship and higher education exists in any other country. The caricature of it presented in the preliminary staff studies of this Committee is so greatly at variance with the fact that they might have been written by some ill-informed foreigner.

So much for the charge of "dominance". There remains the charge that the Council acted as a clearing house for channeling foundation funds in

the "subversive" directions identified by the Committee staff. This requires a few words about the finances of the Council and its relation to the foundations.

For a few years in the early thirties the Rockefeller Foundation did make available modest "free funds" which the Council could spend for research in any way it chose. That practice was preceded and has been supplanted by a system in which the foundation money coming to the Council is specifically earmarked for projects presented to and passed on in advance by the particular foundation making the grant.

In the 35 years of its existence, the American Council of Learned Societies has received and expended about \$9,000,000. A little more than half of this has come from the great foundations. A detailed analysis of the source of all its financial support since 1937 was presented in response to the questionnaire distributed by the Cox Committee and is available to this Committee.

The money coming from the foundations falls generally into two categories. The first covers general administrative expenses and has run, as indicated above, to about \$100,000 annually in recent years. Both the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation have made substantial contributions for these purposes. More and more in recent years, however, the tendency has been to try to meet these costs from administrative charges against funds for specific projects. At the present time the Council is receiving no contribution for central administration from either of these foundations, except as a percentage charge against funds for specific programs.

The second category of contributions from the foundations comprises grants for the support of specific projects for which the Council is responsible. Such projects originate with the Council staff, committees, or members. They must, of course be approved by the Board of Directors. Thence they are submitted to the foundations for support. Usually, if the program receives such support, it is administered by a special committee appointed by the Board of Directors for the purpose.

Such projects or programs may be works of research conducted by the Council itself, such as the *Dictionary of American Biography*. In that case, the special committee picks the editor, who in turn selects the contributors, and the work proceeds under the supervision of the editor and the committee.

In other cases, the project may be a special fellowship or study aid program. The Council has no such funds at present. In the past, it has conducted some 25 separately organized and financed programs of aid to individuals for study, research, or publication in the humanities. From 1926-1954 it has made slightly more than 2,000 awards to about the same number of people. The stipends have ranged between \$100 and \$6,000 and have averaged about \$1,000. Such fellowship and study aid programs are short term operations, extending not more than three years. They are likewise administered

by specially appointed committees who review the scholarly and technical qualifications of the applicants and make the awards. The names of all individuals who have received such awards and the subject matter of the research are regularly published, were presented to the Cox Committee, and are available to this Committee.

All of the Council's projects, of whatever nature, are presented to the foundations on their merits and in competition with projects sponsored by colleges and universities, other research institutions, individuals, and even its own constituent societies. Not only are the funds received from the foundations extremely limited both in amount and in the freedom with which they may be disposed of, but the Council as a matter of policy does not interpose itself between any foundation and any other agency or individual in search of funds. Foundation policies and decisions in such matters are made by the foundations themselves.

Finally, there is the question of recruiting government personnel. As has been indicated above, the Council's contacts with scholars in the humanistic fields and its more recent work on the National Registration in the Humanities and Social Sciences have made it a valuable source of information about the professional and technical competence of individuals in those fields of endeavor. Institutions and agencies in need of such specialized personnel sometimes request information of this character from the Council, and within the limits imposed by available staff time, the Council responds. Such requests are infrequent, and come predominantly from universities and colleges, museums, libraries, and the like, and only very occasionally from the government. Since the Registration has been in usable shape, that is roughly the last year and a quarter, the Council has responded to about fifteen such requests, only one of which came from a government agency.

The information supplied in response to such requests is in no sense a recommendation. To the best of the Council's knowledge, it is not treated as such by the requesting agency or institution. Indeed, where the reference is to the Registration, as it has invariably been since that has been completed, the only information given is that supplied by the individual himself. The Council has assumed that it is not in the American tradition, in a register designed for employment purposes, to inquire about the individual's race, religion, or politics. Any information it might have on these points might be accidental or untrustworthy. It goes without saying, moreover, that the Council has no facilities for investigation and clearance of individuals on security matters. It is not a proper body for such work in any case. Where requests for information come from a government agency, therefore, the Council takes no responsibility for such questions and properly assumes that any individual who is hired will have to meet the applicable security standards imposed by the government.

Conclusion

The body of this statement has been directed, as was no more than proper, to the assumptions and presuppositions which were implicit in the reports of the Committee staff and some of the "friendly" testimony which the Committee heard. But the Council cannot let this opportunity pass without saying vigorously and directly that it does not share a number of those assumptions and preconceptions.

It believes that, far from being committed to any particular body of doctrine, America is a land of boundless experiment, of constant and relentless search for better ways of doing things, for richer experience, to make human life fuller and more attractive. Nothing could be less American than an assumption that Americans had reached the ultimate boundary of thought—political, economic, social or cultural as well as physical—in 1903 or 1953, or are destined to reach it in 2003.

A corollary of this interpretation of our tradition is the belief in the maintenance of a completely free market in ideas, no matter how unpalatable they may be to our preconceived notions. The moment we have to protect any mature American from any idea whatsoever, that moment we must stop boasting about American democracy.

The American Council of Learned Societies is concerned with thought, with ideas, with mankind's concept of itself and its place in nature. It believes that the best interests of America require uncompromising exploration of any thinking that mankind has ever done or is doing. There is no subversion comparable with an interference in the traffic in ideas.

Ideas are explosive materials. They must not be handled carelessly nor ignorantly. All the activities of the American Council of Learned Societies have been directed at creating and fostering in America the mechanisms through which ideas can be handled understandingly and without fear.

To this end it has done whatever it could to develop Americans trained to participate fully in the pursuit and communication of all humanistic knowledge and to provide the tools of study, teaching, and research with which such trained Americans have to work.

The Council is proud of its record in these activities. It holds, moreover, that in the harsh decades ahead, many of our most pressing problems will lie in the very fields of the humanities with which the Council is concerned. In its opinion no work is more important to the future security and welfare of the nation.

On the Conflict Between the "Liberal Arts" and the "Schools of Education"*

I. The Years of Cooperation, 1890-1905

DURING the recent past the criticism of our public schools and our institutions for the training of teachers has assumed a degree of vehemence which, whether justified or not, reveals dangerous schisms in the cultural life of the nation.¹

The following pages are our attempt to inject a more rational note into the debate by laying bare the development of the tension during the past two generations.

One is probably justified in stating that toward the turn of this century the American school system possessed an aspect of greater unity, direction, and cooperation than is the case today.

The modern trend toward specialization has had its impact also on this part of our culture. And since education represents not merely a department of study or an activity that could—or should—be isolated from the totality of a nation's interest and the concerns of thoughtful men from all walks of life, the old question as to the advantages and disadvantages of professionalism could be raised here with increased ardor.

Whereas today a large part of educational policy and of the training of teachers is given to specialists, around 1900 it was under the guidance of a group of men who spoke with authority because they were considered leaders both in education and in the cultural life of the nation. They came together under the auspices of the National Education Association (referred in the following pages as N.E.A.) which was then, as it is still, the leading national educational association. Before 1870 it was known as the National Teachers Association, founded in 1857 as a result of the desire of various existing state teachers associations for effective national representation. After 1870 the

* A report prepared by the Committee on the Teaching Profession of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences: Howard M. Jones, *Chairman*; Francis Keppel; and Robert Ulich. After acceptance by the Council of the Academy, the report was submitted to the Committee on the Relation of Learned Societies to American Education.

¹ For the literature in this field see the "Educational Literature Review: Criticism and Defense of American Education," by William W. Brickman in *School and Society*, Vol. 77, no. 2009, June 20, 1953. In the meantime the number of criticisms and defenses has increased.

National Education Association comprised four departments: namely, the departments of normal schools, superintendents, elementary education, and higher education. With increasing specialization the number of departments increased manyfold. Today the N.E.A. comprises twenty-nine departments and about twenty committees and commissions.²

The first decades of the Association were far from peaceful, a fact unlikely to astonish anyone who has studied the history of our national school system since the times of Horace Mann. There were rivalry among competing organizations, a tendency toward departmentalization and jealousy within the N.E.A. itself, and danger that its short but populous meetings did not allow adequate discussion of problems increasingly complex.

Thus in 1879 an editorial asked for a "national council of educators, composed of the representative men in our several states, who shall hold annual meetings for longer consultation and fuller discussion of the questions which relate to educational work. . . .

"While the great body of teachers"—the editorial continues—"is working with theories of education . . . , their representatives may gather up the results of their labors, may study the trend of educational thought and effort, and advise as to the wisest means and methods for future growth. All this suggests a representative assembly of our ablest teachers and thinkers."³

The editorial must have expressed a commonly felt desire, for, soon after, in 1880, there was formed within the N.E.A. the National Council of Education, composed of sixty members from the Association. This was increased to 220 in 1908. The Constitution of the Council stated its object was "to reach and disseminate correct thinking on educational questions; and for this purpose, it shall be the aim of the Council, in conducting its discussions to define and state with accuracy the different views and theories on the subject under consideration, and secondly to discover and report fairly the grounds and reasons for each theory or view, so far as to show, as completely as possible, the genesis of opinion on the subject."⁴ The Council chose out of its own ranks a standing Committee on Investigations and Appropriations, which started the Association's era of investigative reports in 1892. Some of these reports have had a lasting influence on American education, especially the Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (1893), the Report of the Committee of Fifteen on the Training of Teachers and on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education (1895), the Report of the

² See *N.E.A. Handbook*, 1952-53, p. 285ff and 257ff.

³ Quotation taken from the unpublished thesis of F. R. McKenna, *Policy Evolution in the National Education Association*. (Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1954, p. 38).

⁴ *History of the National Education Association of the United States, 1857-1891*, Washington, D. C., The National Education Association, 1892, p. 39.

Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools (1897), and the Report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements (1899).

Among the Council's charter members were such leading figures as Henry Barnard, with Horace Mann the acknowledged leader during the great "awakening" of American education, from 1858-1860 president of the University of Wisconsin, and from 1867-1870 first U. S. Commissioner of Education; Thomas W. Bicknell, editor of the *New England Journal of Education*; John Eaton, U. S. Commissioner of Education from 1870 to 1886; Daniel Coit Gilman of the Johns Hopkins University; William Torrey Harris, leader of the St. Louis group of Hegelians, pioneer in scientific education and Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906; James McCosh of Princeton University; and Eli T. Tappan of Kenyon College. The famous Committee of Ten included among others Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University (Chairman), William T. Harris, James B. Angell, president of the University of Michigan, James M. Taylor, president of Vassar, James H. Baker, president of the University of Colorado, and Richard H. Jesse, president of the University of Missouri.

Unfortunately, the period of the "great names" on committees directing the country's educational policy was relatively short. It ended about 1905. The pressure of new problems apparently scattered the small groups of national leaders; partly also these problems were of a kind for which the old guard was no longer competent. As a matter of fact, even before the period of the great committees, issues appeared far beyond the orbit of education, if understood in the merely scholastic sense of the word. Women, admitted in 1866, entered the N.E.A. in larger numbers and asked for equal rights; there was the desire for the discussion of teachers' salaries; the relation between education and the government became increasingly complicated. Labor tried to increase its influence on the public school system; the assimilation of minorities became more and more urgent; there was the conflict between nationalism and internationalism; various reform movements asked for consideration; the new technological society in America was no longer satisfied with schools dating from earlier times. Every new volume of the *Addresses and Proceedings of the N.E.A.* reveals a growth in the number of interests.⁵

So strong became the tension that some observers doubted whether the N.E.A. would survive. William T. Harris, who in many respects had shown admirable qualities of intellectual and administrative leadership, was blind to the understandable and necessary demands of the teachers for better living conditions. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, who

⁵ For the enormous range of subjects discussed within the N.E.A. since 1870 see the already mentioned *History of the National Education Association of the United States, 1857-1891*.

thus far had played a most active part in the N.E.A. as well as in education generally, described the situation of 1905 in the following words.⁶

"Then that organization from being a body of genuine educational leaders who were dealing with ideas and institutions, degenerated into a large popular assembly which quickly fell into the hands of a very inferior class of teachers and school officials whose main object appeared to be personal glorification and personal advancement."

II. The Decline

Yet, upon examining the situation more closely, one discovers that it was not merely men, or "inferior" men who were to blame for the change of affairs. Much was due to circumstances beyond the control of individuals. Perhaps these circumstances could have been more wisely met by superior educational statesmen (apparently the great names themselves no longer felt up to the challenge and withdrew), but nevertheless they had to be met in a rapidly expanding school system with issues and problems requiring immediate practical response.

As a matter of fact, the germs of what critics might consider the disintegration of the old liberal education were already present in the work of the great committees themselves. The Committee of Ten under President Eliot,⁷ by giving equal value to each subject recommended for the curriculum, introduced into the American high school, or at least supported, a trend toward mechanical "counting up" and toward the atomization of subject-matter, irrespective of its intrinsic value. The Committee members themselves must have felt uneasy; otherwise they would not have repeatedly admonished that "they [the various subjects] be taught consecutively and thoroughly and would all be carried on in the same spirit; they would all be used for training the powers of observation, memory, expression, and reason; and they would all be good to that end, although differing among themselves in quality and substance."

One today appreciates more than ever the only dissenting note to the Commission's report. This was President Baker who said:

"1. I cannot endorse expressions that appear to sanction the idea that the choice of subjects in secondary schools may be a matter of comparative indifference. I note especially the following sentences, referring the reader to their context for accurate interpretation.

⁶ Nicholas M. Butler, *Across the Busy Years*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934, I, 96. See also chapters VIII and IX of the same book: "Founding Teachers College" and "Some Fortunate Memories."

⁷ There exists a special edition of the *Report of the Committee of Ten*, published for the N.E.A. by the American Book Co., New York, 1894. The following minority report is to be found on p. 56 of this edition.

'Any school principal may say:—"With the staff at my command I can teach only five subjects out of those proposed by the Conferences in the manner proposed. My school shall, therefore, be limited to these five." Another school may be able to teach in the thorough manner proposed five subjects, but some or all of these five may be different from those selected by the first school.'

'If twice as much time is given in a school to Latin as is given to mathematics, the attainments of the pupils in Latin ought to be twice as great as they are in mathematics, provided that equally good work is done in the two subjects; and Latin will have twice the educational value of mathematics. . . .'

'Every youth who entered college would have spent four years in studying a few subjects thoroughly; and on the theory that all the subjects are to be considered equivalent in educational rank for the purpose of admission to college, it would make no difference which subjects he had chosen from the programme—he would have had four years of strong and effective mental training.'

All such statements are based upon the theory that, for the purposes of general education, one study is as good as another,—a theory which appears to me to ignore Philosophy, Psychology and Science of Education. It is a theory which makes education formal and does not consider the nature and value of the content. . . .'

President Eliot under the influence of an educational philosophy similar to that in the Report of the Commission of Ten, established the elective system at Harvard College. After a lengthy criticism of this step, the historian of Harvard, Samuel E. Morison, ends his verdict with the following words.

"The worst effects of the elective system came outside Harvard, and especially in the schools. Eliot advocated the principle of free choice in high schools, overlooking the fact that the normal lad of fourteen to eighteen will always avoid subjects that require hard thought and much expenditure before they yield returns, in favor of those which require no greater mental effort than memory, and pay prompt dividends in achievement. It was due to Eliot's insistent pressure that the Harvard Faculty abolished the Greek requirement for entrance in 1887, after dropping required Latin and Greek for freshman year. His and Harvard's reputation, the pressure of teachers trained in the new learning, and of parents wanting 'practical' instruction for their sons, soon had the classics on the run, in schools as well as colleges; and no equivalent to the classics, for mental training, cultural background, or solid satisfaction in after life, has yet been discovered. It is a hard saying, but Mr. Eliot, more than any other man, is responsible for the greatest educational crime of the century against American youth—depriving him of his classical heritage."⁸

Others, however, may assert that the setting up of electives and the abandonment of the classical program in its old linguistic form was the most

⁸ Samuel E. Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard*, Harvard University Press, 1942, p. 389.

decisive step in the modernization of Harvard, a step without which this institution might be today but another idyllic corner in the antique shop of higher education. Latin and Greek have fought a battle of retreat in every country. The fact may be deplorable, but it is not really due to the malice and stupidity of educators, but to powerful currents in our civilization which education cannot neglect without the risk of remoteness.

Moreover, Columbia University under Nicholas Murray Butler did not resist the trend toward the breaking down of the older united disciplines into an overwhelming variety of subjects. One may, in this connection, read Abraham Flexner's scathing criticism in his *Universities, American, English, German*.⁹

This is now the place where we may leave the historical account of the N.E.A. and its committees for the purpose of a more systematic examination of the problems and developments behind and within the changes in the relationship between the academic world and the public school system. We repeat, it was not merely "inferior men," but broad intellectual and cultural forces which created the increasing alienation between the older tradition (as far as it existed) and the educational specialist who tried to answer the expanding curricular demands both for the secondary school and on the level of teacher training.

III. The Causes of Alienation

1. At the time when the famous representative committees of the N.E.A. began their work, (say, around 1893) there were about 700,000 students in our high schools; around 1950 there were more than 7,000,000.¹⁰ It does not need much practical experience to understand that this fact must have a bewildering effect. Whereas at the end of the nineteenth century the secondary school population was still relatively homogeneous, coming from about the same family backgrounds and with vocational interests not necessarily academic but nevertheless tending toward the preferred echelons of society, the high schools today harbor young people with I.Q.'s running from close to that of the moron up to one of highest intellectual promise. The existing vocational interests of these boys and girls cover the whole gamut of

⁹ Oxford University Press, 1930, p. 130ff.

¹⁰ "One of the most significant features of American society is the growth in the high school population. Since 1890 it has doubled every ten years until the high point was reached in 1940 with an enrollment of more than 7,000,000. The drop in the last decade may largely be attributed to the decline in the birth rate during the thirties. Soon, however, there will be another increase and by 1960 it is estimated that high school enrollment will exceed 8,000,000. Thus, while in 1890 only 7 percent of the eligible youth were enrolled in high school, in 1950 the percentage had risen to 77 percent and there will be further increases in the years ahead." (Annual Report of the Federal Security Agency, 1952. Office of Education, p. 14.)

our immensely diversified vocational life. Also, many students remain in high school not because they like it and want to learn, but because they need a parking place between adolescence and the time when modern mechanized industry finally agrees to employ them. It is unrealistic to believe that these young people can be attracted (or even educated in the way the nation has a right to demand) by exercises in abstract "thinking." Half of them leave school after the tenth grade; and the remaining half, if our information about prevailing opinions among teachers is correct, participate much more passively than actively in their own education. They may be potentially good citizens, but their interests lie outside, not inside, the school. Considering all these difficulties, one should be careful in assessing criticism of the "anti-intellectualism" of the American school and its teachers. There may be financial or other reasons for the "drop out," but one reason is certainly that the last grades of high school, despite all adjustment to average or even below-average intelligence, are still too abstract and verbal for a large part of our youth.¹¹

Like it or not, the American high-school today is not merely a scholastic institution, it is also a social institution. This gradual change has been enforced by the weight of the social forces that a public and universal educational system cannot escape except by losing touch with the people. "Vocational" rather than merely "liberal" subjects enter into the program. It is characteristic of the socialization of the high school that the only committee report of the N.E.A., which has had an effect similar to that of the Committee of Ten, namely the *Report on the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* in 1918,¹² defines the goal of education in a democracy in the following terms:

"The purpose of democracy is so to organize society that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well-being of his fellow members and of society as a whole. . . ."

"Consequently, education in a democracy, both within and without the school, should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends."

¹¹ See further statistics in *Holding Power and Size of High Schools*, Federal Security Agency. Office of Education, 1950, p. 1ff: "One in five of all youth, as represented by the enrollment in the fifth grade, did not reach high school; nearly half of those who entered dropped out before graduation. . . ." "Moreover, of the 42 [percent] who do graduate from high school, fewer than 12 [percent] enter college and only 5 [percent] remain to graduate from college."

¹² Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1918, No. 35. *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education Appointed by the N.E.A.

This is indeed a noble goal. But when one compares the report of the Committee of Ten with its emphasis on subject matter and the main ideas of the report on *Cardinal Principles*, one realizes the change from "subject-centeredness"—however diluted—to a social concept of education. The means of secondary education in achieving its suggested objective are now: "1. Health, 2. Command of fundamental processes, 3. Worthy home-membership, 4. Vocation, 5. Citizenship, 6. Worthy use of leisure, 7. Ethical character."

To understand the change it may be worthwhile to remember that the *Report on the Cardinal Principles* was written at the end of the First World War, which, like every other extended war, had a calamitous effect on the stability of education. That a new specialization in the leadership of public education occurred between the end of the nineteenth and the first two decades of the twentieth century is evidenced by the fact that the Reviewing Committee of the Commission on the Re-Organization of Secondary Education, under the auspices of which the *Cardinal Principles* were issued, lists only one college president, Edward O. Sisson of the University of Montana. The other members were specialists in the field of public education.

2. At the end of the nineteenth century there occurred not only an enormous shift in school population, but also a profound *change in the philosophical aspects of the nature of man and education*. Here also the germs of the change are observable in the work of the great committees themselves. In spite of the dominating influence of William T. Harris and of the Herbartian idealists such as the brothers McMurry, men such as William James and John Dewey were propagating a new kind of philosophy known as pragmatism, instrumentalism, or experimentalism. This paper cannot evaluate the merits and demerits of this kind of philosophy, which in the minds of many teachers and leaders of teachers quickly replaced the older, German-influenced idealism and the religious interpretation of education. Historically, pragmatism entered into a vacuum already opened by the disintegration of the older transcendentalism in all fields of life. The new philosophy offered the prospect of a more valid or "scientific" method, which the new "Science of Education," as well as the other "Social Sciences"—still uncertain in themselves—were most anxious to acquire. Pragmatism emphasized the concrete over and above the abstract problems of life; it showed the significance of social institutions and the evolutionary character of societies and their ideologies. In fostering "progressive education" it also inspired the professionally interested teacher with the hope that through the introduction of these experimental methods he might have an increasing chance for developing initiative in more challenging situations, rather than merely conveying year after year the same subject matter, irrespective of the interests of the students. As always is the case when ideas suddenly spread over a large group, they become diluted and are taken out of context. Such statements as "effort follows

interest," which is essentially correct, may not always have been conducive to the understanding of the necessity of effort. And the practically and philosophically inexperienced person may easily give a one-sided interpretation to sentences like these:

"To set up any end outside of education, as furnishing its goal and standard, is to deprive the educational process of much of its meaning, and tends to make us rely upon false and external stimuli in dealing with the child."¹³ or:

"(1) that the educational process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end; and that (2) the educational process is one of continued reorganizing, reconstructing, transforming. . . . Since in reality there is nothing to which growth is relative save more growth, there is nothing to which education is subordinate save more education."¹⁴

3. In close connection with the pragmatic-experimental movement a *new kind of psychology* attracted the educator. This psychology, while rejecting the older introspective method as being influenced by aprioristic concepts of man, subjected the process of human development and learning to experimental procedure. The main American representative of this new psychology was Edward L. Thorndike, Professor of Educational Psychology at Teachers College, who examined particularly the problem of learning, and who published, together with R. S. Woodworth, his studies on transfer as early as 1901.¹⁵

Thorndike's studies were credited with having refuted the older theory of "mental discipline," according to which "alterations in mental powers are alterations in the general facility of attention, reasoning, etc.," or, "whatever strengthens one faculty, indirectly strengthens all the others."¹⁶ He quotes a number of such older expressions of the theory of "mental discipline" and the inevitable claims of the representatives of various subjects that their "discipline" more than any other exercised its power over the whole mind. Not only Greek, Latin, and arithmetic, but the modern languages, and finally even drawing, offered themselves as drill-masters of the mind. Thus, even in the light of its own original interests, the older theory of "mental discipline" became absurd.

Thorndike's studies, particularly his theory of "identical" elements in certain cases as the explanation for transfer, have now been modified. Yet, as he correctly wrote in his comprehensive work on *Educational Psychology*

¹³ John Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed*, N.E.A. edition, p. 16.

¹⁴ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, pp. 59 and 60.

¹⁵ "The Influence of Improvement in One Mental Function Upon the Efficiency of Other Functions." *Psychological Review*, Vol. 8, p. 247-261, 384-395, 553-564.

¹⁶ *Psychology of Learning*, New York, 1925, p. 360ff.

of 1925,¹⁷ "The notions of mental machinery which, being improved for one sort of data, held the improvement equally for all sorts; of magic powers which, being trained by exercise of one sort to high efficiency, held that efficiency whatever they might be exercised upon; and of the mind as a reservoir for potential energy which could be filled by any one activity and drawn on for any other—have now disappeared from expert writings on psychology. A survey of experimental results is now needed perhaps as much to prevent the opposite superstition; for, apparently, some careless thinkers have rushed from the belief in totally general training to the belief that training is totally specialized."

There is no indication that Thorndike directed his critical inquiry in a spirit of hostility against the liberal arts. Unfortunately, the advocates of classical studies, rather than pointing to the intrinsic and cultural value and beauty of their fields of study, used the theory of mental discipline, or of "training the muscles of the mind" as a defense of the vested interests. No wonder, then, that the advocates of a more utilitarian curriculum now used the experimental findings of the new psychology as a weapon for *their* particular purposes.

Thus, in consequence of mistakes and exaggerations on either side, the new experimental psychology contributed to increase the alienation between the liberal arts and the experts in education and psychology.

As a matter of fact, it did not even need a Thorndike to lay bare the deficiencies of the older psychology of subject-matter and mental discipline. There is in the *Addresses and Proceedings of the N.E.A. of 1896* (p. 174) a remarkable article by Albion W. Small, one of the early sociologists, who criticizes the Committee of Ten under Eliot (blamed by some for destroying the older tradition) for its outmoded concept of mental development.¹⁸

"The Committee of Ten seems to have stopped at conclusions which tacitly assume that psychical processes in the individual are ends unto themselves. To be sure there are signs of a vague looking for of judgment from the tribunal of larger life upon the products of this pedagogy; but the standards of a real test seem to have had little effect upon the committee's point of view. We are told (p. 168) that the mind is chiefly developed in three ways: (a) by cultivating the powers of discriminating observation; (b) by strengthening the logical faculty . . . ; (c) by improving the processes of comparison, i.e., the judgment.

¹⁷ *Educational Psychology*, Vol. II. *The Psychology of Learning*, New York, 1913, p. 364.

¹⁸ Incidentally, the first edition of Dewey's *My Pedagogic Creed*, in which he anticipates the main essence of his work as a philosopher of education, was published together with *The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy*, by Albion W. Small (E. L. Kellogg and Co., New York and Chicago, 1897), which is a reprint of the above mentioned contribution to the *Addresses*.

We are further told that 'studies in language and the natural sciences are best adapted to cultivate the habits of observation; mathematics, for the training of the reasoning faculties; history and allied branches, to promote the mental power which we call the judgment.' The naively mediaeval psychology behind all this would be humorous if it were not tragical. I need not label the pedagogic philosophy with which my sociology allies itself when I declare that sociology, in common with the most intelligent pedagogy of today, refuses to classify educational material along these lines. In the first place education is not an affair of perception, reflection, and judgment alone. Education connotes the evolution of the whole personality, not merely of intelligence. In the second place, if I am not mistaken, a consensus is rapidly forming, both in pedagogy and in sociology, to the effect that action in contact with reality, not artificial selection of abstracted phases of reality, is the normal condition of maximum rate and symmetrical form of personal development. Sociology consequently joins with pedagogy in the aim to bring persons, whether in school or out of school, into as direct contact as possible with the concrete conditions in which all the functions of personality must be applied and controlled. In these conditions alone is that balanced action possible which is the desideratum alike of pedagogical and of social culture."

4. With the rise of experimental psychology emerged the *testing movement*. Here also the origin does not lie directly in education proper but mainly in the work of the Professor of Experimental Psychology at the Sorbonne, Alfred Binet, and of William Stern, Professor of Philosophy and Psychology at the University of Hamburg (later at Duke University), both of whom published experimental studies on the measuring of intelligence. In a highly decentralized country like the United States, in which the standards of achievement are not prescribed and guaranteed by a central ministry, teachers grasp eagerly for an opportunity to check the work of their students by means that promise a degree of objectivity. Moreover, in view of the elusiveness of mental operations the quantitative approach promised more reliable data for the evaluation not only of individual achievements, but of mass phenomena in the field of education. Actually, mental testing has now spread far beyond the schools into industry and administration; it has even become an indispensable means of selection for the armed forces. When wisely used, it has done inestimable good to thousands who otherwise would have been led into false channels and final failure. On the other hand, many experts in the field of testing overestimated the reliability and validity of their scientific approach and their "test batteries." Often one-sidedly trained in mathematics and experimental methods, they were inclined to forget the intangibles of individual development and also those precious values in civilization not now accessible to the quantitative approach.

5. The change from the more deductive, intuitive, and qualitative towards the more quantitative aspects of education has been contingent upon ever-

arching changes in our total society. We live in an age when *organization, technology, and interest in the material* side of progress tend to overpower the more subtle qualities of culture. Together with technical and economic problems, *political problems* often exercise a one-sided influence on the minds of our people. These factors affect not only the interests of adults, but also those of high school students. They turn more and more away from the *études désintéressées*, with their intrinsic, though not immediately provable, values, toward subjects they consider more urgent. In consequence of modern industrial and military competition, the scientist has surpassed the humanist in terms of practical importance and public prestige. That can be shown in the development not only of the secondary school, but also of the modern university.

Perhaps on all levels those responsible for education have yielded too easily to the new trends and forgotten that civilization rests on something more than practical and scientific efficiency. School principals and superintendents have been absorbed by local political and financial problems and "public relations" while the scholastic and cultural responsibilities of their schools have suffered. There are not only many high schools, there are also private schools and universities which see more hope for public prestige in sport and new buildings than in the quality of their teachers. In all these respects, certainly, anti-intellectual tendencies have invaded education.

On the other hand, interests often criticized as signs of anti-intellectualism have actually grown out of a profound responsibility on the part of public schools for the moral development of their pupils. As the Committee on the Cardinal Principles shows, schools feel that, hand-in-hand with the advancement of industrialism and other factors, there has gone an impoverishment of the moral and emotional resources of the human personality. Consequently, the schools have been forced to take over a considerable number of functions which in earlier times were discharged by agencies such as the family, the church, and the life in the community. One may well argue whether the school is capable of fully replacing these influences, but this is not the sole criterion. The fact is that in order to avoid crises, something has to be done to provide nourishment and direction for the activities and minds of young people. Hence there have arisen the demands for "guidance" and "adjustment." To be sure, youth clubs and a large number of other extracurricular activities may deflect a part of youth from more intellectual studies. Other boys and girls, not interested in these pursuits, and often neglected by their families, may be saved from the feeling of loneliness, frustration, and the inclination to try devious ways for the self-assertion of their personality. The concept of the "total child" is no mere vague phrase, not a sign of emotionalism, and anti-intellectualism. Rather it has grown out of the feeling of teachers that they are committed to larger human values than merely scho-

lastic training, which, if given in isolation from larger experiences, is easily forgotten and has then but doubtful value. But here again the defenders of the older "discipline of thought," generally supported by parents of the "college bloc," are inclined to blame the schools for unnecessary busyness.

IV. Critical Notes

We may now add a critical note to the historical explanation of the widening rift between the older liberal arts and "education."

1. If we direct our attention first toward the *institutions for the training of teachers*, we find the following undesirable trends as perhaps unconscious accompaniments of desirable responses to changing cultural and social situations.

First, teachers have given too little attention to those who have warned that the enormous increase of pupils requires a total re-examination of the character and function of the American high school and of problems like the relation between quality and equality in a modern democracy. The enormous increase in the literature on education should not lead us to deny that in the earlier years of American education there was a greater emphasis on humanistic and historical sources and studies than seems to be the case today. One lives too much on secondary materials. At some institutions the Doctor of Education degree has lost even the pretense of scholarship. Often schools of education have just "muddled along," or thought that courses and changes in "methods of teaching" would be sufficient for the enormous task of understanding and improving the role of mass education in a modern democracy. If vigorous discussion, depth, and quality had more generally gone along with the expansion, there would perhaps have been more interest on the part of scholarly communities and thoughtful people in the United States, as well as more effective financial support. Even the fact that a thorough-going overhauling of our high school systems would have found little support from the public and most of the universities, is more an explanation than a real excuse.

There was certainly a willingness to respond somehow to individual differences. But this response has too easily led to educational policies and programs which neglected the objective requirements of learning in a complex civilization. The idea of the "child-centered" school has caused many educators to forget that the verb teaching has *two* accusatives, namely teaching (1) children (2) something. The school and its children cannot alone decide the subjects and values on which depend the survival and constant rejuvenation of an adult society. The teacher is not merely the interpreter of the child; he is also the interpreter of the civilization into which the child has to grow. It is voluntary self-degradation for the teacher to forget the polarity of his mission.

Since about 1850 the confusion between democracy and conformity has led many teachers, doctors, and school administrators to seem to attach to the gifted pupil the stigma of asociality or mental abnormality. Rather than enjoying his presence, they were afraid of him, or embarrassed. While they recommended special classes for defectives, they rejected them for the highly talented children, for fear that snobbishness might be fostered and the unity of the nation endangered. However, in more recent years studies have been published which prove the self-corrective capacity of education. As early as in 1915, three years before the *Report on the Seven Cardinal Principles*, the city of New York began its pioneering work in the schooling of the gifted.¹⁹ But here again, criticism of mistakes should not be made without understanding. The American unilateral school has helped to give unity to a nation that looked with distrust at division of social classes and children.

Second, some of the most important centers of teacher education had apparently forgotten that Dewey's pragmatism, whatever its merits, is not the only respectable interpretation of man, his culture, and his relation to the universe. Pragmatism is as much in need of continual criticism as any other school of philosophy. When popularized by untrained teachers it may lead toward one-sided and relativist interpretations of human existence; and under the guise of the fight against older dogmatism there may develop another dogmatism, ignorant of the wealth and depth of ideas on which our culture is based.

Third, it is a sign of vitality if representatives of novel fields of scholarship look at new methods for the better solution of old problems. But it is at the same time a sign of lack of comprehensive thinking and schooling if a few new findings in the area of the social sciences, especially in psychology, are considered sufficient to resolve complex questions which reach far beyond the competence of these relatively new sciences. The results of a psychological experiment, however valid in themselves, may say nothing about the cultural desirability of a particular subject matter or its significance for personal culture and for civilization as a whole. The explosion of the old myth of mental discipline may say something against psychologically ignorant humanists, who in a false attempt at defending their interests, have recourse to such a myth, but it says nothing against the value of classical studies. Nor have Thorndike and Dewey ever combatted the idea that a mind should be disciplined. Their question is: how?²⁰

Fourth, what has been said about the one-sided application of certain philosophical doctrines and psychological discoveries, can also be said about

¹⁹ See Irving Lorge, "Social Gains in the Special Education of the Gifted," *School and Society*, January 9, 1954.

²⁰ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*. New York, 1929 edition, page 152. "It is hardly necessary to press the point that interest and discipline are connected, not opposed."

psychometry, or the quantitative approach to the problems of learning and intelligence. The value of this approach has already been emphasized. But it is nevertheless only of auxiliary value to educational policy and the planning of educational programs. Tests and examinations determine something about a pupil's capacity to learn and thus, to a degree, about what he should learn. For what he should learn depends in part upon what he can learn. But it is dangerous if on the basis of these data alone, decisions are made or recommended concerning what is worthwhile to be learned and what is desirable and necessary for the continuity and enrichment of a culture. In other words, the value of a subject does not necessarily depend on the learning capacity of so and so many students. If such a principle were followed, the end would be mediocrity, boredom, lack of vision, and final decay.

The effects of such indoctrination cannot be eliminated if there now suddenly emerges a somewhat hysterical cry for "values." For values and standards cannot first be declared to be unscientific and then suddenly reconstructed when the crisis of civilization begins to pinch us.

2. If we now direct out attention toward the *liberal arts*, we may find that the same historical forces are at work.

Complaints against educational training sometimes seem to assume, in most cases unwittingly, that whereas the training of teachers has altered, the training of students in the liberal arts during the years we are discussing has not altered, or at least has not altered in the same way. In this view the liberal arts remain the unshaken guardians of traditional values. Without entering the metaphysical puzzle of what is meant by traditional values, we must observe that while educational philosophy has been transmogrified since 1890 (or earlier), traditional education in the arts and sciences has also altered significantly under the pressure of analogous social and cultural forces.

The burgeoning of American science is so remarkable as to require no comment. Yet, as late as 1880, science courses in the colleges were here and there still taught under the rubric of "natural philosophy," with all that the phrase implies about the authority of religion. In the arts and the social sciences the decades since 1880 have been decades of profound alterations in "values," in pedagogy, and in substance. Some cursory examination of the facts will make clear the nature of these changes.

The last twenty years of the nineteenth century are years of the founding of national organizations of professional scholars—the Modern Language Association of America in 1883, the American Historical Association in 1884, the American Economic Association in 1885, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science,²¹ 1889/90 being typical. The incomparable contribution of these and other bodies to American scholarship, profes-

²¹ Not to be confused with the American Political Science Association, founded in the early twentieth century.

sional training, and undergraduate education is not here in question. But if one were to return to the eighties and nineties of the last century, one would scarcely recognize the general atmosphere of the "arts," however identifiable many formulae might be. History, for example, was strongly under the dominance of Germanic theory; and such disciplines as the creation of a diplomatic text, the genetic study of law, custom, folklore, and the like, the derivation of American political institutions from the Teutoburg forest, and, above all, the scientific monograph as the summum bonum of scholarship (and often of teaching) were characteristic. History seldom came down to contemporary events, it was customarily defined as "past politics," and it principally concerned Western Europe and the United States.

Even more interesting was the state of affairs in the study of literature and the modern languages. Respectable scholarship rested primarily upon philology in the narrower sense of the word—some enthusiasts wished to introduce Anglo-Saxon into the American high school—and the training of Ph.D.'s was so heavily linguistic as to color radically their classroom interests. At a meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1892, Francis A. March reported with pride that professors of English could now "make English as hard as Greek." Leading scholars confined research principally to editing manuscripts and establishing texts, as renaissance humanists before them had done for Latin and Greek. These texts were usually from the older periods (Old English and Middle English). Scholarship could be respectable down to, or through, the seventeenth century, and some bolder souls even came down to Robert Browning, but on the whole contemporary books, "creative writing," American literature, the theater, student journalism and the like commonplaces in contemporary English departments were unknown or disapproved.

The modern foreign languages were also in their way "Germanic." Here again the editing of texts and a sound mastery of philology were important. One can almost breathe the atmosphere of academic orthodoxy before 1910 by opening the pages of the great edition of *Faust* by Calvin Thomas of the University of Michigan and Columbia. Part I was issued in 1892, and revised in 1898. Part II appeared in 1897. The erudite introduction to Part I occupies 80 pages. These comprise: (1) Preliminary remarks upon *Faust* and the study of *Faust*; (2) the data of the legend; (3) preparatory experiences of Goethe; (4) the genesis of the First Part (the pre-Weimarian scenes, the Fragment of 1790, the completion of the First Part); and (5) the principal characters. The 230 pages of Goethe's actual text give rise to over 100 pages of textual notes and 14 pages of appendices, the latter including an immense bibliography. Part II is even more formidable. In general Thomas's *Faust* represents on an enlarged scale the foreign-language textbook of the day, in which the establishment of a correct text, a genetic study of the work of art, comments upon parallel passages or source passages, remarks upon the gram-

mar, syntax, or diction of the poem, a short biography of the author, and other bits of erudition were placed before the toiling junior as if the principal purpose of reading foreign literature were to turn the young man or woman into a miniature replica of the Ph.D.

If James's *Psychology* was to appear in 1890, if the way was being opened for the conflict between absolutism and relativism which has enlivened American philosophic history, orthodoxy was more characteristic than not of most departments of philosophy in the last quarter of the last century. As late as 1879-80 President Noah Porter was trying to prevent William Graham Sumner from using as a textbook that unorthodox metaphysician, Herbert Spencer; and at Princeton, McCosh, chief proponent of the Scottish school, then orthodox in the universities and particularly in the colleges, did not leave the presidency until 1888. An eclectic approach to the problem of teaching philosophy to undergraduates was not characteristic of most instruction in that subject until the twentieth century. Even where eclecticism held sway, philosophy was often a highly technical subject, so much so that not many years ago the American Philosophical Association sent a committee of inquiry around the nation to find out why so many students shunned philosophy.

These brief excursions into the past, however inadequate, serve to validate the fact of change in academic subjects. American literature has come up, philology has gone down, the writing of fiction and poetry in the colleges has increased, and requirements in Old and Middle English have diminished in response to this change. Neither the requirements for the teaching of the modern languages is today what it was when the colleges catered to a small and homogeneous social group, to whom French was a part of polite "culture." General education, like general literature, has taken over the undergraduate curriculum where the elective system once reigned. In the social sciences, courses offered have an immediacy of interest to the undergraduate facing a troubled world that was not to be found when Jevons or Marshall or even John Stuart Mill was the accepted text. In a hundred courses in political science, government is more process than theory; and in the vast majority of American colleges it is safe to say that psychology (especially of the unconscious), social psychology, and anthropology seem to be the "new learning" that makes some of the traditional disciplines pale their ineffectual fires. In truth, the arts and sciences have commonly yielded to social and cultural pressures—they could do nothing else—precisely as the schools and theories of education have been forced to yield. The point is not to justify the pot and the kettle in calling each other black; the point is to observe the significance of this vast and general change in the American concept of education—a change observable at all levels. But not all defenders of academic disciplines recognize the radical alteration we have just sketched.

Despite all these changes going on within their own fields, many pro-

fessors took a defensive attitude rather than welcomed the opportunity to enlarge their departments through contact with new problems. As has already been indicated, it took time before even the modern languages and the study of the mother tongue and its literature were granted a respectable position. This, historically speaking, is not astonishing because in earlier times the "gentleman" learned such subjects at home or during the grand tour. Our high schools and colleges, however, are no longer populated with these gentlemen.

In consequence of their defensive attitude, the traditional departments allowed newer subjects to establish themselves as independent segments. If, for instance, the philosophical and historical departments had seen more clearly their obligations towards newer forces in society and the resultant rise of the "social sciences," a stronger sense of continuity could have been preserved and the influence of the "humanities" on the new learning and the new society could have been strengthened. Truly, there is not much use or comfort in looking backward when its past can no longer be restored. Yet, one cannot help be reminded of the beginning of this century when, for example, the Philosophy Department of Harvard had a James and Münsterberg, not only outstanding philosophers, but also leading psychologists. And it may not be amiss to raise the question whether the old universities of Europe, in which such combinations still exist (partly not because of wisdom, but because of lack of finances), have really lost so much as some American professors seem to believe.

For it may partly be due to just this American trend toward specialization (far greater, by the way, than was ever the case with the German university!) that there exists among a considerable number of the defenders of the liberal arts a shocking ignorance of the social problems with which the modern school is confronted. Consequently, these professors attack many of the most well-meant endeavors of our public schools on the basis of inadequate and fallacious criteria. Certainly, the capacity of thinking is one of the supreme criteria of man; it can never be sufficiently cultivated. Yet, our modern schools were in no position to apply this criterion as their exclusive measure of achievement. If they had tried to carry through the program of one of the foremost critics of our high schools and colleges (that every modern citizen "should understand the great philosophers, historians, scientists and artists"),²² our whole national life would be in danger of collapse. It would banish into the limbo of ignorance and futility the great majority of this nation, including a considerable number of university instructors.²³

²² Robert M. Hutchins, *The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society*, N. Y. 1953.

²³ In connection with the danger of using inadequate criteria for judgment, see the article by Robert T. Harris, Lecturer of Philosophy, Southern Illinois University, of

Many of the defenders of the "liberal" studies—identifying the term "liberal" with the study of a limited number of subjects—fail to see that the life of a nation, though depending on ever-expanding knowledge, also depends on the preservation of decent human relationships for which, whether one likes it or not, schools also are in some degree responsible. As a matter of fact, when one examines the catastrophies that have occurred in some modern nations, one arrives at the conclusion that these catastrophies have arisen not out of lack of schooling, but out of deep disturbances in the social and moral relations of societies in which a small group of privileged and well-schooled men were unable to save the people from disaster; indeed, they even helped to lead their fellowmen into it. In other words, modern barbarism, though partly a matter of thinking, is also a matter of impoverishment of the emotional life. Even at the risk of being criticized for anti-intellectualism, the schools cannot neglect their duties in regard to these deeper aspects of education.

V. What Can Be Done About It

What can be done in order to remedy the situation?

To repeat: Though criticism is needed, there is no salvation in the present fashionable tendency to attack the public school system by the use of incommensurate criteria, forgetting completely that this school system—whatever its obvious defects—has been for about a hundred years the most important instrument in the amalgamation of millions of poor immigrants and native citizens. As a matter of fact, this great achievement has been made possible largely by the use of methods severely criticized by outsiders. Without an attempt at understanding the complexity of a school system which at the same time should fulfill the demands of equality and of quality, of justice and differentiation, of democracy and of an elite within this democracy—and without undergoing the difficult task of relating development in education to broad changes in our social and cultural pattern—without such endeavors on all sides, there can be no productive discussion. On the other hand, those responsible for public education cannot always defend themselves by pointing at the interrelation between the school and its environment. This

"The Aims of the Public Schools" (American Association of University Professors *Bulletin*, Summer, 1953, Vol. 39, No. 2, p. 243ff.) which points at some of the confusions in Prof. Bestor's *Educational Wastelands*. Dr. Harris says among other things: "Most pupils to whom secondary school teachers and principals bid farewell are going, somewhat regardless of mental potential, not to college, but to life. . . . The teachers and principals . . . know more about the likely careers and needs of these young persons than do most professors of liberal arts and sciences. . . . They know their [the pupils] individual powers and limitations, and they know the community which is their backdrop. Besides, the teachers and principals bear a degree of immediate responsibility both for the lambs who are going to college and for the kids who are not."

interrelationship exists, but it does not mean that the school should be nothing but the obedient servant of a given society. It should also be one of its trustees and a part of its living conscience.

Nor would it help, even if this were possible, to absorb the departments of education in other departments, for instance those of philosophy, history, psychology, social science, and philology. The problems of education in their historical, philosophical, psychological, didactical, and administrative aspects have become so complex that it is impossible to deal with them competently without a total devotion to the task. If there is need of any proof of the impossibility of dealing with education, so to speak "lefthandedly," one has only to read the books by some modern critics of public education and of the training of teachers. Scholars who contribute greatly to our understanding of the history of civilization and even of education, may nevertheless be incompetent when they pass judgment on the present educational scene. Only competent criticism will be accepted by educators; incompetent criticism but widens the gap.

Looking at the history of the N.E.A. and especially the era between 1890 and 1905, one may be inclined to recommend the rejuvenation of committees similar to those which, at that time, exercised such a wide influence. No doubt something of this sort is desirable. One might invite the N.E.A. to expand its Educational Policies Commission. As a matter of fact this Commission, created in 1935 by the Executive Committee of the N.E.A. and the American Association of School Administrators, has published some highly influential books such as *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy* (prepared by Charles A. Beard, 1937); *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy* (1938); *Education of the Gifted* (1950); and others.

In the Educational Policies Commission men of considerable national influence have served recently, among them Ralph Bunche, Director of Trusteeship of the United Nations, and Arthur H. Compton, Chancellor of Washington University. The Chief Executive of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, was a member of the Educational Policies Commission while President of Columbia University. The question is, however, how much time these men could devote to the task. As our historical survey shows with respect to the Committee of Ten, there is no guarantee that the recommendations of such a committee would be really conducive to better education. As a matter of fact, one of the most recent publications of the Educational Policies Commission, namely *Education for All American Youth: A Further Look* (1952), accomplished with the cooperation of outstanding citizens, is a highly controversial report, hailed by some as the most cogent expression of the American democratic spirit and by others as new evidence of the dilution of high-level academic concepts.

One might also think of bringing about a cooperation of the American

scholarly academies with the Educational Policies Commission, the American Council on Education, or the Office of Education. This last agency has sometimes convoked advisory councils but in recent times seemed to have abstained from this policy—perhaps for lack of adequate finances. Possibly the creation of a Secretary of Welfare in the cabinet may be promising here.

Another possibility too rarely tried would be the creation of committees within the colleges and universities entrusted with the task of a continual exchange of ideas between the liberal arts and the departments of education, and between higher and secondary education generally.²⁴ The lack of contact between the practical schoolteacher and the universities is deplorable. Liberal arts colleges and state teachers colleges work in close geographical neighborhood without the slightest communication. They have no knowledge of each other. Yet, there are state teachers colleges which, in terms of clarity of purpose and scholarly interest, might well compete with those many liberal arts colleges from which there has rarely come a real contribution to knowledge.

An immense amount of work is to be done in the fields that connect education with the humanities. We possess no modern and scholarly monographies on the great educators from Comenius up to our modern time, and there are no good editions of the works that have had a decisive influence on Western education. Neither such monographies nor such new editions would be accepted by publishers, while there is an abundance of mediocre textbooks. In spite of a large number of "Histories of Education" there exists no history of American education which would live up to modern historical standards. Consequently, young scholars do not feel encouraged to engage in the kind of patient and devoted study which is the requisite of scholarly progress. During the past decades our philanthropic foundations have spent a considerable amount of money for "reports" and so-called "empirical research."

Would it not be worthwhile to set aside some financial resources for the building up of a scholarly staff in these neglected areas? Some hopeful beginnings have been made, but not enough.

Some of the great universities have published reports indicating their interest in the broader aspects of education. But unless there is willingness among *all* members of university committees on education to understand the problems of the American school system and to abstain from the temptation to meddle into the inner affairs of other departments, such committees again might do more harm than good. Yet, whatever leads to an exchange of ideas

²⁴ Such a program is partially represented by the work of the John Hay Whitney Foundation in sending promising high school teachers for a year to a graduate school of arts and sciences.

should be welcomed, even if there is no immediate practical result. The mutual education of instructors of the same universities or in scholarly associations and councils would be in itself of greatest value. It might even lead to the discovery that many of the criticisms which have been advanced against public schools and teacher training from outside have been discussed within the educational faculties more competently and in a more balanced fashion.

The main condition for improving the relation between the departments of education and the university would be the avoidance of early specialization among the students of education, psychology, and the social sciences in general. There has been a tendency to forget that segregation of educational and social questions from the totality of human civilization and from the deeper aspects of the person may lead to pseudo-solutions and distorted interpretations of human problems. Therefore, education and the adjacent social studies, as a special professional endeavor, should be based on a broad liberal training which permits comparison of phenomena, criticism of methods, and insight into the intangibles of human life. Only such students should be allowed to train future teachers who themselves have developed a fine sense for human values and a knowledge of their systematic and historical aspects. Of course, similar demands should also be made with respect to those who specialize in the "older disciplines of thought" or in the natural sciences. The good teacher and scholar will always be the one who is able to see his special field of interest within its wider context.

In several universities attempts at widening the base of education have already been made. But in many other institutions there still reigns a spirit of mutual distrust and even hostility which deflects into other departments young men and women essentially interested in education.

There is, however, one factor that is outside the orbit of the academic world. Even the most well-intended universities will be greatly hindered in their endeavors unless they are supported by a change of public opinion. Paradoxically enough, exactly in the American democracy with its loud talk about the value of education, the social role of the educator is not attractive, and the devotion necessary for being a good classroom teacher is inadequately rewarded. Here is a field where the great scholarly associations together with the respected colleges and universities could do inestimable service to the future of the American school.

Scholars Look at Education

by

J. FLETCHER WELLEMAYER, JR.

The twentieth century may very well be recorded in history as the period in which the American commonwealth began to exploit its brain-power. At the turn of the century there were about seventy-five million Americans, only half of our present population. About four percent of those aged 18 to 21 were in institutions of higher learning and about eleven percent of the population of high school age were in school. These ratios have increased sharply, concurrently with the increase in population. By last year we had something over twenty-five percent of the 18 to 21 year olds in college, and nearly eighty percent of those of high school age in secondary school. The result has been a vast increase in the number of scholars and teachers in higher education and an even greater increase in the secondary field.

These pressures on the educational establishment have had three results, the first two of which have applied especially to the secondary schools: 1) a great increase in the number of persons engaged in teaching at all levels; 2) great expansion of the individual's teaching load and a tendency to divorce scholarship from teaching; and 3) development of a high concern with improved techniques of teaching, together with an expansion and revision of the curriculum.

The conditions necessary for this expansion had been created by a century of effort. The obvious need, in a democracy, for an educated electorate led to the acceptance of the principle of free elementary schooling for all, supported by local tax funds. Meanwhile, public secondary schools had begun to be established, but the legality of using public funds for this purpose was not assured until the Kalamazoo Case of 1872. The development of state-supported universities began very early in Ohio, and somewhat later in a number of other states. The movement received considerable impetus after the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 which provided land grants for state colleges of agricultural and mechanical arts.

Meanwhile, a number of other decisions were being elaborated, bearing on the nature of higher education and the place of scholarship in the American educational structure. The rights of private colleges to resist political domination were established by the Dartmouth College Case of 1819. Early efforts to broaden the curriculum beyond the rigidities of purely sectarian

education, such as those of Jefferson and his associates at the College of William and Mary in 1779, had ended in failure. The continuation of the fight at Harvard, Brown, and Michigan, although without immediate success, prepared the way for the creation of The Johns Hopkins University in 1876. Drawing heavily on German university experience, this institution provided an American standard for the development of modern graduate training. Its success in avoiding both sectarian and political control and its emphasis on research and scholarship had a deep and continuing effect on scientists and scholars elsewhere.

The latter half of the nineteenth century was also a period of rapidly increasing specialization and rising professional standards. This was reflected in the founding of great numbers of professional societies in many new fields. As an example, of the twenty-five societies constituting the ACLS, only five were in existence before 1869. Between that date and 1905 thirteen were established. This group contains all the large, national, disciplinary associations in the ACLS. Broadly speaking, the earlier ones were more general in character, the later ones more specialized. The expanding number of higher educational establishments all across the continent made the emphasis on professional standards very important. The creation of scholarly journals was a necessity if faculty members in widely scattered institutions were to keep in touch with developments in their fields.

A final development of the late nineteenth century to be mentioned in this connection was the emergence of the field of psychology and the beginning of its application to learning theory. The work of William James followed by that of E. L. Thorndike exerted a profound effect on education everywhere and established the field of educational psychology. The appearance of psychology as a separate field was an aspect of the rapid growth of specialization affecting all fields. It is of interest that its earliest applications were to the field of education; this has characterized much of the psychologists' subsequent work. The adoption of psychological findings by John Dewey, and his interest in the social aspects of the educational process produced another major impact on American education.

Thus, at the beginning of the century, the foundations for expanding the educational system of the country had been laid. The secondary school had been accepted as a legitimate public activity and was in a position to expand rapidly on the basis of tax revenues. The colleges and universities were recognized as a mixed public and private system, with public revenues coming mostly from the state governments. The standards of university training were rising and scholars were attempting to define professional standards in many fields and to obtain their adoption. America was entering a period of rapid industrialization in which the need for an educated electorate was reinforced by the needs of urban industry for an educated labor force and

a vast number of highly-trained technicians. Specialization was increasing rapidly in all fields, and educational psychology had already exercised an important influence.

During the past fifty years the tendencies noted above have continued. Specialization has continued to grow, and the scholars' interest in research has been reinforced in many areas.

The remarkable advances in physics and mathematics which occurred about the beginning of the present century have tended to obscure, in the popular thinking, the noteworthy advances occurring at the same time in many other fields. The idea of relativity, for example, and even more importantly, the impact of this principle on the Newtonian idea of causation, could not and did not fail to affect the field of philosophy. In history, American scholars entered on a new phase of much more critical analysis. An example of this development was the publication of Charles Beard's *The Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, in 1913. The field of sociology shook itself loose from primary concern with social welfare. The field of public administration and of the rational study of management began to develop. In the field of economics half a dozen major figures grew up in the first three decades of the century. The historians of art had begun to examine non-European art—Chinese, Japanese, African, and American Indian. The nineteenth century growth of interest in modern languages and literatures brought the great Western literatures into the colleges at a time when the literatures themselves were changing sharply.

Scholars began to take an interest in the study of whole civilizations rather than confining themselves to detailed examinations of single political units in relation to political and diplomatic developments. The touchstone of this development was an interest in culture as a whole and with it developed the new field of cultural anthropology. Almost as a by-product the field of linguistics developed in response to this influence in relation to the traditional study of philology.

The scholars, conscious of their increased numbers and stimulated by these extraordinary intellectual developments, tended to give first attention to the recording of the new findings, coupled with the training of a new generation of scholars. They were also much concerned about the problems of communicating new developments among themselves, and these interests found an outlet in their professional societies, in the planning of meetings, and the formulation of publication programs.

Many scholars were, however, diverted by these pressing interests from any particularly active interest in the astounding development of public education below the college level. As noted above, the rise of attendance at the secondary school level far outstripped the rise, even relatively, in college enrollments. The specialization of the period encouraged the growth

not only of educational psychology, but of the field of professional education. Specialists in all fields have been exceedingly cautious in dealing with the subject matter of any field other than their own, and for the very good reason that the mastery or "control" of another field is difficult and time-consuming. This caution has unfortunate effects in many areas of scholarship, but with the field of education it has meant that the scholars have lost contact with the institutions preparing students for college and university work. As a result, the comments of scholars and scientists regarding secondary school problems have had some tendency to be divorced from reality and have often been greeted by professional educators as irresponsible carping or worse.

There has been developing in the past two or three decades an interest in synthesizing influences. Perhaps the interest in the Great Books program of the twenties was an expression of this urge. During the thirties these interests began to be formulated into plans for various kinds of "general education" programs. It is noteworthy that the humanistic disciplines are now almost universally regarded as having central importance in such schemes. It is also true that general education programs require humanists to plan much broader courses of instruction than they had previously been offering. It is heartening that humanistic scholars have actually taken the lead in the development of new syntheses of existing knowledge. Much of this remains to be done in all fields, but more has probably been done in the humanities and the social sciences than in the natural or the physical or biological sciences. A series of examples could be cited but one will suffice.

We have the broadening of the field of history to the study of whole civilizations or areas. Both historians and literary scholars have recognized that the understanding of a particular period requires the study of all fields of cultural development. The results of this recognition have taken several forms. The history of ideas has assumed much greater importance, as has the study of the history of science. The field of American Studies encompasses history, economics, literature, music, folklore, and philosophy. This development has influenced the various efforts to study Western civilization, Western history, and Western thought as a whole. The study of Slavic and Oriental societies, as now organized in the United States, follows this same general pattern.

Developments like these mean that American scholarship is beginning to equip itself for the strenuous educational efforts which lie ahead. Not only do we have to anticipate a major increase in college enrollments over the next decade or two, but our very survival in a world which is changing at an accelerating rate depends on the extent to which a new generation of college students can master a much broader understanding of the peoples of the entire globe. They must also master a broader understanding of their

own culture, and achieve in greater numbers at earlier ages the ability to reach intellectually mature judgments about our pressing social and political problems. A greater number must learn to carry serious intellectual interests with them into their non-academic lives. This requires efforts by scholars to amass the materials for such studies, the modification of existing disciplines, the creation of new ones. Perhaps, most importantly, it requires that we let many fewer of our intelligent youth discontinue their education below the college level, and that those who come to college come with an improved preparation. It is the understanding of these problems of the future by many of our scholars in various fields which has led to a reawakening of interest in the problems of education as a whole. This interest is, of late, becoming much more practical, and is expressing itself in concrete plans to look critically, but constructively, at the disciplines themselves and at their place in the whole educational structure. The most comprehensive expression of this interest has occurred in the ACLS during the past year.

Recent Activities in the ACLS

The Secretaries of the twenty-five constituent societies of the ACLS met as usual in New York in January 1953 concurrently with the annual meeting of the Council. Almost spontaneously, an uneasy feeling that the societies had not been completely fulfilling their responsibility towards education coagulated itself into a desire for action: a committee of exploration was appointed. The committee quickly learned that a number of the societies had a strong interest in developments in American education. Accordingly, a conference was called in which these matters were discussed and enough interest was expressed to justify the appointment of a Committee on the Relation of Learned Societies to American Education (CORLSAE). The conference enjoined its committee

- (1) To draw up a proposal based upon plans presented by those constituent societies of the ACLS which may be interested for study of their proper relation to American education, with especial reference to the preparation and certification of teachers for secondary schools, junior colleges, and four-year colleges, and to explore the possibilities of cooperation with learned societies not associated with the ACLS; and (2) Through the proper channels of the ACLS, to secure funds for the support of such study.

The continuing committee was duly appointed and undertook, first, to determine how the various societies were to participate in cooperating in such a program. It also made an effort to learn what actions the various scientific and applied science organizations were making in this same field. The matter was discussed further among the secretaries present at the an-

nual meeting of the Council in 1954. Reports from societies were considered at a second meeting of CORLSAE early in March. It was evident that various societies had different kinds of interests and had varying amounts of experience in this field.

In the field of religion the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis expects to work closely with the National Association of Biblical Instructors (possibly through a joint committee) in pursuing the difficult problem of determining the place of Biblical studies in American education. The Modern Language Association of America has had a Committee on Trends in American Education for the past dozen years. That association is now embarked on an extensive study of the place foreign languages should occupy in American life. It is considering a related program which would include the field of English. In the field of linguistics the Linguistic Society of America considers that its function is at this stage primarily the encouragement of research and publication in the field of linguistics. The ACLS Committee on the Language Program, however, has appointed a special Committee on the Relation of Linguistics to American Education, and experimental programs have already begun in the Maryland and Virginia sections of the Washington metropolitan area.

In the face of these varying circumstances CORLSAE decided at a second meeting to establish a program which would allow maximum flexibility in the development of programs by the individual societies and at the same time assure necessary coordination and guidance to the societies in their operations in this difficult field. It is also clear that a few societies already well advanced in their attack on this problem would probably prefer to continue independently.

For example, the American Economic Association has already produced reports on the undergraduate teaching of economics and graduate education in economics. It currently has a Committee on Economics in Teacher Education concerned with the place of economics in secondary school education. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, while not concerned with any one specialized discipline, appointed a committee on the teaching profession which has already rendered a report on the present conflict between the liberal arts and the schools of education. (see p. 17)

The American Anthropological Association has appointed a committee to consider the problems of teaching, teacher training, placement of trained students and teachers, etc. The American Folklore Society has a committee on education. It has circulated a questionnaire to determine the present status of folklore study in schools and colleges. Some bibliographical data have already been published; several other problems have been considered.

The American Historical Association has established a new committee to examine the whole problem and to develop a program. The AHA has

a considerable history of interest in this field, having had nine committees on the relation of history to American education since 1895. About twenty volumes and reports have been published. Nevertheless, the AHA is currently much concerned with this problem and its present committee is considering next steps in this field. The American Philosophical Association has voted to appoint a committee on teacher training and recruitment and further reports will undoubtedly be forthcoming. The American Philological Association has already prepared a plan to revitalize graduate training in the classics. It is currently being prepared for presentation to prospective sources of support. The Archaeological Institute of America has for some time successfully managed to bring archaeological matters to the attention of many groups outside the profession. It expects to continue to expand these efforts. The American Sociological Society has two related committees, one on professional standards, and one for liaison with the National Council for Social Studies. The College Art Association has expressed a lively interest in this subject, established a small committee, and prepared a tentative plan for inquiry into this field.

One or two societies are very close to practical action programs in this field. The Committee's recommendation, therefore, was that the ACLS attempt to provide a strong individual in the central offices who can furnish the necessary leadership, coordination and guidance. Individual societies would continue to develop their own plans as rapidly as possible which would be presented to sources of support at such time as they were ready.

This proposal was discussed by the Board of Directors of the ACLS at its most recent meeting, at which it was

Voted: To accept the report of the Committee on the Relation of Learned Societies to American Education; to authorize the Executive Offices to prepare a budgeted program; and to authorize the Chairman and Executive Director to seek funds and otherwise implement such a program.

The extent of professional society response to this program appears to be one of the most striking and significant developments in recent decades. Professional societies by nature are primarily vehicles for the exchange of disciplinary information. The growing interest in the problems of teaching and of educational organization and theory indicates an acceptance by these organizations of a much broader and altogether fitting role in our society. The objectives of scholars in the present situation are to find means of offering constructive cooperation at all levels of education. There is a recognition that college and university academicians have a responsibility toward the entire educational structure. Because relatively little action along these lines had been taken in the past few decades, a variety of approaches will be

tried and some of them might be unsuccessful. The success of the program will obviously depend on the extent to which individual scholars in all parts of the country are able to confer with teachers and administrators in a constructive way at all educational levels. The response to the CORLSAE inquiry not only by secretaries and trustees of learned societies, but by individual scholars throughout the nation makes it likely that the program will be successful.

gram
parts
con-
SAE
indi-
will

Report of the Twenty-eighth Session of the Union Académique Internationale at Bern, Switzerland, June 14-19, 1954

by

CHARLES E. ODEGAARD

Delegate of the American Council of Learned Societies

THE Twenty-eighth Session of the UAI was well attended, delegates being present from the member organizations of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States.

The Société Suisse des Sciences Morales, the host member, arranged for a very efficient meeting and overwhelmed the delegates with the spirit of hospitality.

Full reports on the UAI projects will appear in the *Compte Rendu*. One can report, however, with reference to most long-standing projects of international cooperation that the hiatus produced by World War II now seems definitely passed. Progress has been reported for most projects.

Two years more may see the completion of the *Dictionnaire de la terminologie du droit international*. Each year now sees the publication of a few fascicles of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, and the 100th fascicle is clearly in sight. A review of the regulations for this extensive international project will be undertaken by a committee of experts during this next year.

Distinct progress has been made in reviving the prewar project with reference to unpublished historical documents concerning Japan in Western archives. The Japanese government has appropriated some funds largely for microfilming documents in archives in England, Spain, the Netherlands, Portugal, and the Vatican. Professor Iwao of the University of Tokyo is visiting European archives and discussing the project with interested Western scholars.

Medievalists in many fields will be interested in the progress made in the last several years in breathing life into the old project for a new dictionary of medieval Latin. The next issue of the *Bulletin Du Cange* will contain an informative article by Franz Blatt of the University of Aarhus, Denmark, on "Le Nouveau dictionnaire du latin médiéval." Professor Blatt has suc-

ceeded Professor Baxter of the University of St. Andrews as chairman of the editorial committee. He expects to complete during 1954 the articles on the part of the letter L (la-le, lo-lu) for which he assumed direct responsibility.

The Comité Internationale d'Histoire de l'Art has developed a plan for a *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi* and proposed that the UAI join in sponsoring this project made possible at least within conceivable financial limitations by the fact that most medieval stained glass windows were removed for safe-keeping during World War II. Subsequently they were cleaned and replaced and are now susceptible of photographing under far more favorable circumstances. Decision as to the formal relationship of the UAI was left to the Bureau since further consultation with the member academies seemed necessary.

The Bureau will also undertake a thorough review of the statutes of the UAI. When adopted in 1919 the UAI was incorporated under Belgian law. Certain revisions are now in order to keep the statutes conformable to Belgian law, but it was decided to broaden the scope of the review to incorporate proposed changes more in keeping with actual practice as it has developed in thirty-five years.

The next meeting of the UAI will be held in Brussels and will be shortened to the four days extending from Monday evening, June 13, to Friday noon, June 17, 1955.

THE UNITED STATES BOOK EXCHANGE

The Foreign Operations Administration has entered a two-year contract to pay the United States Book Exchange, Inc., \$50,000 a year to furnish technical, scientific, and educational literature to libraries in fifty-three countries. A primary purpose of this program is to build up back-issue stocks of technical periodicals and books in countries participating in the FOA program. Funds made available through the FOA contract will be used to meet handling fees and shipping charges at the Exchange. Under the arrangement, the USBE will supply technical publications to libraries and institutions in FOA countries without cost, but will require publications in exchange, although not necessarily on an item-for-item basis immediately. FOA's overseas missions are notifying libraries, institutions, industrial groups, and other organizations of the facilities of the program. Initially no limit will be placed on the number of periodicals or books which any library may request.

The United States Book Exchange is a private non-profit organization sponsored by the national learned societies, of which the ACLS is one, and library organizations in the United States. It began its operations six years ago as a cooperative clearing house for the national and international exchange of publications among libraries. Its membership includes 450 libraries in the United States and 150 libraries in forty-four countries abroad. Its prin-

principal directors and officers include librarians of several major public, private, and university libraries.

The USBE is not in competition with normal commercial publishers and booksellers since it deals largely with surplus materials. Its present holdings number over two and a half million pieces, the greater number of which are periodicals. The exchange program operates through U.S. and foreign libraries which send publications to USBE from their own collections for exchange credit. All participating libraries are notified of available materials from which they may draw. Foreign members receive lists of U.S. publications, usually arranged according to general subject categories. American and Canadian members receive lists of both foreign and domestic publications arranged according to language or country of origin. A revolving priority system assures members of equitable distribution. Orders are usually processed within a month after their receipt at USBE; items not available at first processing are held on back order for a year unless the ordering library directs otherwise. Although withdrawals are expected to be matched with contributions on an item-by-item basis over a reasonable period of time, the USBE is prepared to permit foreign libraries to operate on long-term or permanent "overdrafts" on their accounts. No charge is made for the publications supplied.

Member institutions may send in for exchange credit any publications in research fields: monographs in science and technology published during the last ten years, those published in the humanities, the arts, or history during the last fifteen years, as well as recognized classics of older date. There is no date limit on periodicals, which are acceptable in the same fields whether as scattered issues or as long runs. Most other types of publications except newspapers are acceptable. Members may submit lists to USBE for checking prior to shipment, but the USBE will also accept unsorted shipments, sort them, and assign exchange credit for those items which qualify. If more than ten copies of any one publication are sent in for credit, the USBE should be consulted in advance. Each item represents one unit of exchange credit. No monetary value is placed on exchange publications.

All libraries and institutions must prepay shipping charges on publications sent to USBE.

Any inquiries concerning the United States Book Exchange should be addressed to that organization in care of the Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

THE RENAISSANCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

The Renaissance Society of America was organized on January 30, 1954, at Columbia University. Delegates from regional Renaissance groups active in several sections of the United States, and representatives of a number of

museums, libraries, and professional societies with interests in the Renaissance, met by invitation of the University Seminar on the Renaissance, and of the American Committee on Renaissance Studies. The latter had been organized on January 31, 1953, to take over the work of the Committee on Renaissance Studies founded in 1938 by the American Council of Learned Societies.

The purpose of the Society, as expressed in its constitution, is the advancement of learning in the field of Renaissance Studies, and especially the promotion of interchange among the various fields of specialization, such as the visual arts, music, Latin and the modern literatures, classical scholarship, the sciences, law, philosophy, religion and theology, political, economic and social history, and any other fields of learning which may deepen or broaden understanding of the Renaissance period.

The Society proposes to implement this purpose by sponsoring suitable projects, by publishing, and by assisting and encouraging discussion groups and providing means for the dissemination of information of interest to Renaissance scholars. It also proposes to extend its cooperation to individuals and organizations with similar interests abroad, both to increase the effectiveness of American scholarship and to promote international understanding through cooperation and the cultivation of common interests. It will also undertake to initiate or further efforts to make the primary sources of research available to scholars and students both at home and abroad, and to provide such bibliographical and other guides as will make scholarly travel more fruitful.

The Society begins its corporate life with a well established journal. In 1947, with some help from the American Council of Learned Societies and the Dartmouth College Library, a quarterly journal, *Renaissance News*, was founded by Frederick W. Sternfeld as a means of communication among the many scholars and students interested in the Renaissance. This journal, already familiar to many, will now be published by the Society in an enlarged form. The Society has also undertaken the publication of a volume of Renaissance Studies covering a variety of subjects and fields. The University of Texas has volunteered to bear the cost of this volume which will be edited by William Peery and distributed to all members of the Society.

The *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, which was initiated and sponsored by the Renaissance Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies, and which was subsequently sponsored by the ACLS as a whole, and by several learned societies both in America and abroad, has been adopted as the first project to be formally sponsored by the new Society. This project is intended to lead to the publication of annotated lists of Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations from ancient Greek; and of Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Commentaries on ancient Latin and Greek authors. This project, when completed, will furnish an important contribution to the

history of classical scholarship in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and will serve to illuminate the interests and attitudes of the translators and commentators in their respective periods.

As presently organized, the governing body of the Society is an Advisory Council which elects from among its members an Executive Board. The Advisory Council is made up of representatives of local and regional groups, and of an equal number of specialists in the various disciplines. The latter are nominated by the Executive Board and elected by vote of the members. The Advisory Council meets once a year. No general meeting of members is planned, as yet, but regional meetings will continue to be held regularly.

The advice and help of established scholars will be sought by the officers of the Society in the development of policy and in the undertaking of new projects. The active support of younger scholars is also imperatively needed. In addition to private as well as academic scholars, membership is also extended to art and book collectors, patrons, publishers and writers. Members will receive *Renaissance News*, the journal of the Society, and all other periodical publications issued by the Society.

Officers for 1954 are John Herman Randall, Jr., President; Josephine Waters Bennett, Executive Secretary; and Edwin B. Knowles, Treasurer. The address of the Society is 1161 Amsterdam Avenue, New York 27, New York.

Notes

Thomas Munro, Delegate to the ACLS from the American Society¹ for Aesthetics, has been awarded the Legion of Honor by the French government. This citation was made for his work in developing cultural relations between the United States and France.

* * * * *

The annual report of the Chancellor of the University of Chicago, Lawrence Kimpton, reports that during the past year John A. Wilson, Delegate to the ACLS from the American Oriental Society, was made a Distinguished Service Professor at the University.

* * * * *

A non-profit organization, the Population Council, Inc., has recently been established to encourage research and education in the relationship of world population to material and cultural resources. The Council has already made a number of grants to universities and other established organizations and has created a number of fellowships for the training of students in the field of population. For information relating to this program, address inquiries to Frederick Osborn, Executive Vice-president of the Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, New York.

* * * * *

In February 1954 the Columbia Broadcasting System, in collaboration with New York University, inaugurated a series of thirteen weekly television programs on archaeology. The series, entitled "Here is the Past," was sponsored by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. The narrator, Casper J. Kramer, discussed such subjects as the purposes of archaeology; the circumstances under which cities are deserted; the discovery and identification of lost cities; methods of exploration, excavation, preservation, recording, and interpretation; and the dating of finds.

* * * * *

The Fifth Congress of the Art of the Middle Ages was held during 1953 in Spain. It assembled in Pamplona on September 13 and ended in Toledo on September 27. The various Western European countries were well represented. The only representative from the Western Hemisphere was Kenneth

Conant of Harvard University, President of the Archaeological Institute of America.

* * * * *

The Southern Humanities Conference met at Emory University, Georgia, on May 14-15. The ACLS representative, Sturgis Leavitt, was present.

* * * * *

Columbia University has announced the establishment of a new Department of Uralic and Altaic Languages. The President of Columbia, Grayson Kirk, has indicated that this Department is unique outside the Soviet Union itself in the concentrated attention it will be able to bring to bear upon the areas within these language complexes which cover most of the Soviet Union, parts of central Europe, Finland, Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Outer Mongolia, western China, and Korea.

The Department will provide complete offerings in Hungarian, Turkish, and Mongolian in the fall. Finnish and Korean will also be presented on a limited scale and will be extended as rapidly as possible once the Department is in operation. These new courses will be introduced so as to provide a systematic study of the literature and philology of both language areas.

The staff of the new Department, of which John Lotz of the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics has been made the Director, will include three professors and four lecturers in Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish, and Korean. This expanded language program will supplement studies and research now being carried on at Columbia at the Russian and East Asian Institutes, in Near and Middle Eastern Studies, and in the Program of East European Studies which will also begin in the fall.

* * * * *

The American Political Science Association, one of the constituent societies of the ACLS, has announced the award of fellowships of \$4,000 each to five journalists and five political scientists for a nine-month period during which they will serve as Congressional internes. The recipients will work with Congressional committees and on the staffs of members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The purpose of this program, which is financed under a grant from the Edgar B. Stern Family Fund of New Orleans, is to provide an opportunity to study the legislative process and to give the country a better understanding of Congress.

* * * * *

A Selected List of Books and Articles on Japan in English, French, and German, originally published in 1940 by the Committee on Far Eastern

Studies of the ACLS, has been revised and enlarged under the auspices of the Harvard-Yenching Institute and published by the Harvard University Press. The compilation was prepared by Hugh Borton, Serge Elisseeff, William W. Lockwood, and John C. Penzel. It contains more than seventeen hundred titles which were carefully chosen as a guide to the general reader and a research aid to the serious student of Japanese civilization.

* * * * *

The National Interest and Foreign Languages, a discussion guide and background work paper based on the findings of the first half of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association, has been prepared by William R. Parker, Secretary of the Association and Secretary of the Board of Directors of the ACLS.

Topics covered in the publication include: Which Second Language? Should Language Teachers Also Teach the Foreign Cultures? What Training for Tomorrow's Language Teachers? Foreign Languages and International Understanding; The International Exchange of Persons; The Development of Structural Linguistics; and Language and Area Studies.

The booklet may be ordered from the U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Price, \$0.45.

* * * * *

Current Soviet Policies, The Documentary Record of the Nineteenth Communist Party Congress and the Reorganization After Stalin's Death, was edited by Leo Grulio, Editor of the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*. It may be obtained from Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publishers, 105 West 40th Street, New York 18, New York. Trade edition, \$6.00; text edition, \$5.00.

* * * * *

The Far Eastern Association, one of the constituent societies of the ACLS, has announced the publication of the second of a series of monographs: *China's Management of the American Barbarians* (A Study of Sino-American Relations, 1841-1861, with Documents) by Earl Swisher, professor of Far Eastern history at the University of Colorado. The principal value of this work lies in the fact that it covers the period of Sino-American relations before formal diplomatic relations were established. The translated documents present the Chinese official view of the United States as expressed by the Emperor and the Court on the one hand and the local officials on the other. Merle Curti, in the foreword, points out that this book is also a mirror for Americans: a Chinese view of the United States enabling us to see ourselves as someone else saw us. Thus, besides its main contribution to

diplomatic history, it provides first-hand materials for American intellectual and social history.

Copies are available from Far Eastern Publications, 26 Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Price, \$7.50.

* * * * *

From *UNESCO Features* come two items of interest:

A UNESCO-sponsored international agreement eliminating tariff and trade restrictions on the circulation of educational films, filmstrips, sound recordings, microfilm, glass slides, wall charts, maps, and posters has received the tenth ratification necessary for its entry into force. The agreement will come into full-scale operation on August 12. The contracting states, at present, are: Cambodia, Canada, Haiti, Iraq, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Salvador, Syria, and Yugoslavia. Eleven other countries, which have signed the agreement but not yet ratified it, are Afghanistan, Brazil, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Iran, Lebanon, Netherlands, United States of America, and Uruguay. In order to enjoy the benefits of the agreement, which grants exemption from all customs and quantitative restrictions and from the necessity of applying for an import license, the producing country must certify the materials to be of an educational, scientific, or cultural character. Another UNESCO agreement, removing tariffs on books, works of art, and a wide range of other educational materials, is already being operated by eighteen countries.

UNESCO has also established an International Federation of Translators, with organizations in Denmark, France, the German Federal Republic, Italy, Norway, and Turkey as charter members. Organizations in Japan, the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia and other countries are considering their adherence. The first Congress of the Federation is to be held at UNESCO House, in Paris, during September. UNESCO recognized the cultural loss, resulting from the solitary confinement of great works in the cells of their original languages. Bi-lingualism, improvements in language teaching, and the expansion of auxiliary languages will continue to be useful and important, but these do not reduce the need for honest and creative translations. Specific projects to be considered by the Federation include: creation of an international institute to maintain lists of translators, provide a central library, establish international contacts and encourage international exchanges; translations of works which have so far been neglected by commercial publishers, in cooperation with UNESCO's program for the translation of great books; problems of copyright and the prevention of literary "piracy."

* * * * *

Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publishers, and the American Committee for

Cultural Freedom have announced their joint sponsorship of The Cultural Freedom Award. This award of \$1,000 is to be given for a book-length manuscript on the subject of cultural freedom, with an emphasis on any of the following: the dynamics of the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism; the status and meaning of intellectual freedom and civil liberties in the United States; or the effects of American policy, attitudes, and culture on the free world's struggle with Communism.

Contestants should be teachers or graduate students at an American college or university. Persons with other qualifications should query first before submitting manuscripts. Only book-length manuscripts will be considered. The deadline for submission is May 31, 1955. Judges will be Sidney Hook (Chairman, Department of Philosophy, New York University), Hans Kohn (Professor of History, City College of New York), and Peter Viereck (Associate Professor of History, Mt. Holyoke College). In addition to the cash award, the author of the book chosen will receive one half of all royalties accruing from publication in the Praeger series on world affairs. All inquiries and manuscripts should be addressed to Cultural Freedom Editor, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 105 West 40th Street, New York 18, New York.

* * * * *

The Conference on Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought, sponsored by the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, was held at Arden House, Harriman, New York, on March 26-28, 1954. Thirty-nine participants and invited guests were present, representing fourteen colleges and universities. The papers presented and their authors are listed in detail in the June 1954 (Vol. 8, No. 2) issue of the Social Science Research Council's *Items*. Steps toward preparation of a volume encompassing the some 1,000 pages of manuscript which had been produced by the participants are underway.

* * * * *

The *Renaissance News* (Vol. VII, No. 2), Summer 1954, the quarterly publication of the Renaissance Society of America, reports that the surveys of Renaissance Scholarship, of which a volume was sponsored and published by the American Council of Learned Societies in 1945 and as part of which several articles have appeared since, have been furthered by the appearance of Andrew Angyal's (University of Debrecen, Hungary) "Recent Hungarian Renaissance Scholarship," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, fascicule 8 (1954), p. 71-94. Inquiries about reprints should be addressed to S. H. Thomson, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

* * * * *

Volume V, Number 1 of the *Newsletter* contained a list of forthcoming international conferences in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Additional information is now available on two of these meetings:

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), General Conference, Eighth Session, will be held in Montevideo, Uruguay, November 12-December 11, 1954.

Pan American Institute of Geography and History, Sixth General Assembly and Third Pan American Consultation on History, Fourth Pan American Consultation on Geography, and Seventh Pan American Consultation on Cartography will be held in Mexico, D. F., Mexico, November 20-December 11, 1954. Inquiries may be addressed to Robert H. Randall, President of the Institute, c/o Bureau of the Budget, Washington 25, D. C.

Two additional conferences of possible interest to *Newsletter* readers have been scheduled:

July 1955 has been decided upon tentatively as the date for the Third Pan-African Congress on Prehistory (prehistory of the African continent; anthropological and palaeontological research), to be held at Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia. Inquiries should be addressed to J. D. Clark, Organizing Secretary, Rhodes-Livingstone Museum, P. O. Box 124, Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia.

A Middle East Conference, International Geographical Union, is to be held in Istanbul, Turkey, September 26-28, 1955. Address inquiries to George H. T. Kimble, Secretary Treasurer of the Union, c/o Twentieth Century Fund, 330 W. 42nd Street, New York 36, N. Y.

* * * * *

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

The mailing list for the *Newsletter* includes almost 400 names outside the United States. In exchanges and in other ways we receive a number of scholarly publications which we believe should have a wider audience. We propose, therefore, to include mention of these and of other activities of our colleagues in other countries as a regular feature in the *Newsletter*.

In December 1953, Chu Chia-hua, President of Academia Sinica, presented a report on that organization to the Committee for Education of the Legislative Yuan. According to this report, the Institute of History and Philology and the Institute of Mathematics, two of the fourteen Institutes composing the Academia, were located in Taiwan. Dr. Chu's report mentioned the last meeting, held in Nanking in December 1948, with eighty members in attendance. At the time of the 1953 report sixty-two of these were on the mainland, twelve were abroad (a majority in the United States), and seven were in Taiwan.

In December 1948 the books and instruments belonging to the Institute of History and Philology had been shipped from Nanking to Shanghai and were later sent to Taiwan on a ship which had been provided to transport to Taiwan the treasures of the Peiping palace museum. The two thousand boxes are still stored at the railway station at Yang Mei, about twenty-two miles west of Taipei. Most members of the Academia Sinica staff are living at Yang Mei. Their living conditions are poor, and a number of them teach at the University of Taipei to increase their income. The operating expenses of the Academia Sinica in 1953 amounted to about \$4,000 U. S. dollars.

In spite of obvious difficulties, however, the Institute of History and Philology has resumed publication of its *Bulletin* (in Chinese). The contents of these issues were as follows: (Vol. XXIII, Part I, 1951) A Comparative Study on the Eclipse Periods, Past and Present (Kao Ping-tze), On the Linguistic Materials of Tai-Shan, Kwangtung (Chao Yuan-ren), The "Kuyung" Institution of the Han Dynasty (Lao Kan), On the "Lang" and "Li" Institution of the Ch'in and Han Dynasties (Yen Keng-wang), The Kiangnan Arsenal of the Ch'ing Dynasty (Ch'uan Han-sheng), Notes on the Archives concerning the Boxers' Uprising Kept in the Palace Museum (Wu Hsiang-hsiang), An Investigation of the Bow-and-Arrow Industry in Chengtu, Szechuan (T'an Tan-chün), Historical Notes on the P'o Jen (Ruey Yih-fu), On the Migratory Routes of the Moso Tribe (Li Lin-ts'an), and A Note on the Phonetics of Chengtu Dialect (Yang Shih-feng); (Vol. XXIII, Part 2, 1952) Rules of Textual Criticism (Wang Shu-min), Further Notes on the Wooden Records of the Han and Ch'in Dynasties (Ch'en P'an), Studies on the Bilabials in the Rimes of the Third Division Based on their First Fan-ts'ie Characters (Chou Fa-kao), An Analytic Study on the Original Meaning of the Word "Hsing" (Yang Hsi-mei), On Dpal Chen Po (Li Fang-kuei), Burials Discovered in Section C of the Excavated Areas of Hsiao-t'un (Shih Chang-ju), A Hypothesis on the Use of the Belt Hooks Discovered in the Excavated Tombs of the Chan Kuo Period—480-222 B.C. (Kao Chü-hsün), Studies on the First Fan-ts'ie Characters in a Newly Found Manuscript of Ts'ie-yün, edited by Wang Jen-hsü (Tung T'ung-ho), An Illustrated Catalogue of Stone Edge-tools Excavated from Yin-hsü (Li Chi), Notes on the Word "Chi" (Chang Ping-chüan), Cliff Burials in China and Southeastern Asia (Ling Shun-sheng), and A Chronology of the Western Chou Dynasty (Tung Tso-pin); (Vol. XXIV, 1953) On the Authority and Status of the "Shang Shu Sheng" of T'ang Dynasty (Yen Keng-wang), On the Nature of the Six Canons of the T'ang Dynasty and the Problem of their Enforcement (Yen Keng-wang), Notes on the Mandatory Codes of the Ming Dynasty (Huang Chang-chien), Notes on the Biography of Wang Keng in the Ming History (Huang Chang-chien), Notes on "Ming Wai She" (Huang Chang-chien), Corrigenda on the Tabulated Notes of

the Provincial Governors during the Reign of the Emperor Shunchih in the Manuscripts of the Ch'ing Dynasty (Li Kuang-tao), The Forest of the Stone Tablets and the Buddhist Caves of Yao Hsien, Shensi (Shih Chang-ju), Daily Costumes of the Han Dynasty (Lao Kan), The Stone Carvings Excavated in Changwu Hsien, Shensi (Shih Chang-wu), Writings on Silk in the Pre-Ch'in Period and the Han Dynasty (Ch'en P'an), Notes on the Chinese Grammar (Chou Fa-kuo), and Seiza, Squatting, and Sitting on the Ground (Li Chi).

* * * * *

In a different field, but still from the Far East, is the *Kobe Economic and Business Review*. This journal is a publication (in English) of the Research Institute for Economics and Business Administration of Kobe University. The aim of this Institute "... is to carry on the scientific and synthetic study of Industrial Economy in its two teams of research work, namely, the Research Team of International Economy and the Research Team of Business Administration." In addition to these regular research sections, the Institute has two committees for study in the field of international economy: the Committee on Asian Economy and the Committee on Latin American Economy.

The 1953 issue of the *Review* contains the following articles: Present Day Significance of Free Ports (Ginjiro Shibata), Development of Devaluation-Problem in Post-War Japan (Kiyozo Miyata), Japan's Trade with South and South-East Asian Countries—A Statistical Analysis (Fukuo Kawata), The Exchange Control Policy in Post-War Japan (Masahiro Fujita), On the Official Statistics of Foreign Trade in Post-War Japan (Hikoji Katano), On Business History (Tadakatsu Inoue), Problems of Regional Industrialization in Japan (Minoru Beika), A Research of Wage Income in Post-War Japan (Nobuko Nose), Revaluation in Japan (Susumu Watanabe), and Last-In, First-Out Inventory Method under the Japanese Tax Law (Munehiro Masuzaki).

* * * * *

The first three issues of *Area and Culture Studies*, a publication of the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, have also been received. Although all but two of the articles (those on teaching and learning foreign languages) are in Japanese, brief summaries in a Western language are provided for the main articles. Articles included in the three issues are: (I, 1951) Cultural Functions of Language (Sugiura Ken-ichi), On Robert Frost (Ando Ichiro), Significance of German Sociology in the Modern World (Suzuki Yukitoshi), Some Characteristic Features of the Chinese Vocabulary (Kanegae Nobumitsu), On Area Studies (Kawabe Toshio), Various Problems on Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages (Ogawa Yoshio), J. Nadler's *History of*

German Literature (Ikoma Yoshitoshi), and Stalin and the World Language Problem (Togo Masanobu); (II, 1952) On Rochdale Pioneers (Goto Shigeru), On Mass Society and Public Opinion (Kamba Toshio), Flaubert, de sa Jeunesse à la Creation de *Madame Bovary* (Suzuki Kenro), Lu Hsün's Mind—How It was Formed (Tanaka Seiichiro), On Animals Found in "Gulistan" (Gamo Reiichi), Various Problems on Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages (Ogawa Yoshio), and Portuguese Sources for the Study of Sixteenth Century Japan (Hoshi Makoto); (III, 1953) Modern Trends in English Secondary Education (Matsumoto Naoie), Entstehung und Grenzen des Euphemismus (Fujita Goro), On Choryu Shimokawabe—An Introduction (Okubo Tadashi), The Development and Characteristics of Soviet Family Law (Komori Tetsuo), English Studies during the World War II and After (Sasaki Tatsu), Alessandro Manzoni and the Unification of Italian Language (Okuno Takuya), and On P. K. Benedict's View on the Lineage of the Siamese Language (Matsuyama Osamu).

* * * * *

From Bogota, Colombia have come the *Revista Colombiana de Antropología* (Vol. II, No. 2, 1954) and the *Revista Colombiana de Folklore* (Vol. II, No. 2, June 1953), both official organs of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology and published in Spanish. The contents of the former include: Estado y Necesidades Actuales de las Investigaciones Afro-Colombianas (Thomas J. Price, Jr.), Aspecto Socio-geográfico de la Provincia Fisiogeográfica formada por el Valle del Río San Juan y por el Codo de los Mellizos y sus estribaciones hacia el Río Cauca (Ernesto Guhl), Características de la Personalidad Masculina y Femenina en Taganga (Alicia Dussán de Reichel), Arqueología de las riberas del Río Magdalena, Espinal—Tolima (Julio César Cubillos Ch. y Victor A. Bedoya), Investigaciones Arqueológicas en la Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff), La Influencia del Bilingüismo como Factor de Transformación de un Sistema Fonológico (Jean Caudmont), Medicina y Magia entre los Paeces (S. Bernal Villa), Fonología Puinave (Jean Caudmont), Reseña de Libros y Revistas, and Noticias Antropológicas. The last item in the publication is an official resolution in memory of Ralph Linton.

The *Revista Colombiana de Folklore* includes the following articles and departments: En el día americano del indio (Antonio Andrade Crispino), Contribución al Diccionario Folklórico Americano (Félix Coluccio), El canto popular en el Departamento del Magdalena (Samuel Jaramillo Henao, S. J.), Los maestros y el folklore (Aristóbulo Pardo), Riñas de gallos y vocabulario de gallística (José Antonio León Rey), El folklore en los juegos escolares (Leandro Miguel Quevedo G.), Prácticas culinarias en una población mestiza de Colombia (Alicia Dussán de Reichel), Notas sobre la

evolución del vestido campesino en la Colombia central (Orlando Fals Borda), Algunos mitos de los indios Chami-Colombia (Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff), Cuentos y leyendas de La Guajira (Jean Caudmont), Aspectos de la cultura Páez, La fiesta de San Juan en Calderas, Tierradentro (Segundo Bernal Villa), Shamanismo entre los indios Paeces (Horst Nachtigall), El cauchero en el Vaupés (Marcos Fulop), Estampas provincianas (Alfonso Piñeros y Piñeros), Criollo: Definición y matices de un concepto (José Juan Arrom), Los nombres de animales en Mwiska y su aspecto semasiológico (Luis V. Ghisletti), El castellano y las lenguas indígenas de América (Luis Flórez), El arriero de Antioquia (Epifanio Mejía), Reseña de Libros, and Informaciones Folklóricas. The last section includes a resolution by the Colombia Institute of Anthropology honoring the memory of Wendell Clark Bennett.

* * * * *

The Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz has issued its Yearbook for 1953 and has published its proceedings in monograph form. Those of the Klasse der Literatur include the following papers: Klopstocks 150. Todestag am 14 März 1953 (Hans Henny Jahnn), Der sensitive Mensch. Versuch einer Darstellung am Bilde des Dichters Rainer Maria Rilke (Richard Kraemer), Das Wesen der Gemeinschaft in der deutschen und in der französischen Literatur (Robert Minder), and Dichterische Grundsituation und notwendige Besonderheit des Gedichts (Wilhelm Lehmann). The proceedings of the Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse include: Diderots Neveu de Rameau und die Goethesche Übersetzung der Satire (Ernst Gamillscheg), Der alte Name der persischen Neujahrsfestes (Wilhelm Eilers), Varros Schrift "de poematis" und die hellenistisch-römische Poetik (Hellfried Dahlmann), Sklaverei und Humanität im klassischen Griechentum (Joseph Vogt), Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder (Paul Hacker), Dämonie des Blickes (Dagobert Frey), Die Behandlung ausländischer Vornamen im Russischen in neuerer Zeit (Erik Amburger), Die propädeutischen Kapitel aus dem Paradies der Weisheit über die Medizin des 'Alī b. Sahl Rabban at-Ṭabarī (Alfred Siggel), Arabische Schriftzeichen als Ornamente in der abendländischen Kunst des Mittelalters (Kurt Erdmann), Über die unechte Alternative zwischen dem Kollektiv und dem Einzelnen (Carl August Emge), and Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache (Paul Thieme).

Clavileño (Revista de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanismo) is published bi-monthly in Madrid. The January-February 1954 issue contains a number of reproductions of photographs and paintings, both in color and

in black-and-white, and the following principal articles: *Hacia una historia de la lírica a lo divino* (Bruce W. Wardropper), *Las obras cortas de Calderon* (Kenneth R. Scholberg), *Elementos funcionales en las "Sonatas" de Valle-Inclán* (Joaquin Casaldueiro), *Sobre las citas de pintores españoles en los tratadistas de arte franceses* (Emilio Orozco Diaz), and *Astapa, Numantia y Calagurris* (Antonio Garcia y Bellido). William Berrien, long associated with the ACLS, was among the founders of the Association.

oria
eron
alle-
los
ntia
ated



